National Anti-Slavery Standard.

VOL. XX. NO. 4. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JUNE 11, 1859. WHOLE NO. 992.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, ON SATURDAY,

AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM,

BY THE

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

At its Office, No. 5 Beekman Street, over the Park Bank,

AND AT THE OFFICE OF THE

PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

107 *North Fifth St., above Arch, Philadelphia.*

Letters for publication, or relating in any way to the editorial conduct of the paper, should be addressed, "*Editor of the National Anti-Slavery Standard, New York.*"

Letters enclosing subscriptions, or relating in any way to the business affairs of the paper, should be addressed, "*Publisher of the National Anti-Slavery Standard, New York.*"

RATE OF ADVERTISING.10 cents per line each insertion.

Selections.

NEW ENGLAND ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION.

SPEECHES OF WENDELL PHILLIPS

At the New England Anti-Slavery Convention, 1859.

AT the meeting held on Wednesday evening, May 25th, in Music Hall, Mr. PHILLIPS spoke as follows:

MR CHAIRMAN: I am rejoiced to see before me perhaps the largest, certainly one of the largest, anti-slavery gatherings that Boston has ever known; one of the largest that has ever come to bear the opinion and purpose of this Society on the subject of slavery. I have seen Faneuil Hall crowded, many times, when some startling event brought all Boston together; but on occasions like this, where no particular incident, but only an ordinary session of our Convention solicited an audience, we have, I may safely say, the largest gathering which Boston has ever given. We meet under fair auspices then, and there certainly is a marked change in the public feeling towards us. This very hall reminds me how great the change is in the public sentiment in Massachusetts. For I do not regard the Anti-Slavery enterprise as single. It is one of a brotherhood. It only makes part of the great modern idea of human rights, individual rights; the sanctity and worth of the individual; the safety of leaving the individual as unfettered as possible. The whole history of Massachusetts, from its very commencement, is a history of the constant reaching out of brave and bold minds to fathom and sound the untrodden ocean beyond, and see how safely men could throw aside the stay-horses, the safe-guards, the bulwarks, the anchorages of old institutions, and trust to unfettered, individual man. Our movement is a part of this history. Once, the wealthy thought they must take care of the poor—see that they did not hurt the State. Once, the educated thought they must restrain the ignorant, and provide the conscience and the safeguard which God forgot to put into the human heart when he pronounced man perfect. Our past is a history of the loosening and loosening of these chains, and letting the man stand up alone. You sit to-night under the roof where, for fifteen years, Theodore Parker and others of us have uttered religious sentiments, which, when I came to the bar, I saw a man indicted for blasphemy for uttering, under the old law of the Puritans; and nothing but the energetic protest given awakened men, for the first time, to the danger of the latent bigotry of Massachusetts, saved the State from the disgrace of putting freedom of religious thought into its common jail, without sympathy—as it did actually close the door upon the victim, quickly released. That was freedom of the mind. Massachusetts recognized then the safety of throwing away the spiritual chairs which she had not, up to that moment, recognized the fact that she wore. Ours is the freedom of the body. This meeting to-night, counted by thousands, assembled in the most luxurious hall of the city—is it no evidence of progress? Edward Everett, a little more than twenty years ago, recommended the Legislature to provide every one of us with a cell in the State Prison, for the sin of coming to such meetings as this. Indeed, we should make a jolly company! (Laughter and applause.) I do not mean to say that in bold, manly, outspoken, unequivocal and unmistakable language, Gov. Everett recommended that course, because *that is not in him* (laughter). He belongs to that immortal class,

> "Willing to wound, and yet afraid to strike;
> Just hints a fault, and hesitates dislike."

He let the Legislature understand, in delicate, guarded, equivocal, nicely-chosen and double-meaning phrases—habitual to him—that the opinion of the Governor, if they would not press him too hard, was that such a meeting as this was indictable at common law, and the penalty should be imprisonment; for such a meeting buzzarded the peace and perpetuity both of the plantation and the Union!

A VOICE—"Where is Edward Everett now?"

MR. PHILLIPS—I do not know. All I know is, that this is a very comfortable State Prison, if it be indeed the one Massachusetts provides for us in 1859 (laughter and cheers).

Now, I use these facts thus. We are not so good as our fathers, if we are just like them; because every age has its own duties; and to be really like our fathers, we must outdo them. That is, we must take their essential principles, and, not stopping at their use of them, go on and apply them, as they did, to the pressing *evil* OF THE DAY, do *our* duty in *our* age, not merely perpetuate their merits, like the Chinese making his whole set with a crack according to the model sent him. Massachusetts achieved for us spiritual liberty. The common sense of the Commonwealth gracefully affected not to understand Gov. Everett, and here are we to-day, in the enjoyment of the utmost freedom of discussion on the subject of slavery.

But look at this platform, ladies and gentlemen; look at this meeting. It is met to consider the great sin of the age; the great blot on American character the black stain on American pretension to Republicanism—that which Europe considers our great, momentous question—the only one which darkens the brightness of our national horizon. Every sixth man and woman in the country liable to be sold at auction; every sixth man and woman in the nation forbidden by statute to learn to read; an indictable offence to teach every sixth man and woman in the country to read the alphabet; every sixth man and woman in the nation forbidden to have a husband or wife; the sanctity of marriage, by statute, systematically and of purpose annihilated in regard to one-sixth part of a nation calling itself Christian! That is the sin which, year after year, we assemble to consider. No clergyman of any repute puts his foot on this platform; no politician who has any hopes puts his foot on this platform; no man whose name can by any possibility be offered for the suffrages of the people ever puts his foot upon this platform. The greatest moral question of the age, the only moral issue, under discussion, in a country that looks to forty thousand pulpits and the Bible as the guides of its religious sense, instead of these boards being covered by clergymen, so that I, a lawyer, cannot find a square inch to stand upon, it is impossible to find a Doctor of Divinity to stare at (laughter).

That is the condition of the Anti-Slavery movement. I allow there are other movements; there is a political movement, for certain territorial purposes; there is a Republican party, for certain State purposes. I am speaking of the heart of Massachusetts—the religious purpose of Massachusetts, grappling with the great sin of thirty millions of people. Year after year, it comes up solely represented by this assemblage, and no man who loves his reputation is to be found here. Take that fact, and go with it as a test of the state of the public mind, and the influences of the religious and intellectual forces that go to make public opinion.

I do not descend to any individual cases—mine is a national indictment. Why do I make it? Because I want a country to love. As Burke said, "In order to love your country, your country must be loveable." I remember, twenty years ago, when I read the life of Granville Sharpe, the London apprentice, the lawyer, who studied law in order to probe the slave question, the incident in his life that touched me closest was the escape of a poor negro whom he found on board a vessel which had reached the Downs, and was under weigh for the West Indies. Chained to the mast, the hopeless victim was straining his gaze, through eyes bathed in tears, to catch a last glimpse of that land which he had fondly thought would be a shelter for him—an hour more, he would lose sight of it forever; but he struggled to keep the sight of it to the last. The stout English man plants his foot on the deck, spite of the captain's threats and violence. The chain is burst. Crying now for joy, the glad freeman follows Sharpe into his boat, who has the right to tell him, "The land you struggled to keep sight of through those bitter tears has a safe shelter for you forever." God bless it! Is not that a land to be loved? (Applause.)

Now, Mr. Chairman, I long for the same proud pleasure in Massachusetts that Sharpe had on the glad bosom of the Thames that day.

About a fortnight ago, there anchored on the south side of Cape Cod, in one of those quiet harbors, a Massachusetts brig. Chained to her capstan was one of the noblest men who ever breathed Massachusetts air.

You and I were born free—little credit to us. He, not only, under God, was born a freeman, though in chains, but took his life in his right hand, and, at the risk of death, hid himself in the hold of the vessel—without air, without food, without room to move until he got near to Massachusetts waters. Then, when nature, exhausted, could bear it no longer, he was obliged to make his way to the deck to die. They seized him; chained him to the capstan; and made their arrangements to carry him back to slavery. The Telegraph flashed forth and back the question how this should be done. Meanwhile, through the long still hours of a New England Sabbath, the pirate ship floated calm on the sunny sea. In Boston streets men whispered—on the harbor wharf the owners took counsel—before they went in to worship God, or after the form of prayer was finished, and not one finger was lifted for the man who carried all Bunker Hill in his heart. Not one rebellious pulse stirred that village; not one pulpit exhortation, not one Massachusetts protest. The day rolled on; Massachusetts men unfurled their sails, weighed anchor, and took him back to that hell which, though hotter than Rome ever threatened, will never be hot enough for them (loud applause). That is your Massachusetts! Last winter, this body led the way in going to the State House, and asking of a Republican—of a REPUBLICAN—of a REPUBLICAN Legislature a law that should make it a State Prison offence to carry back a man, no matter where from, or with what horrid rites devoted to the fate of a slave, from the soil of Massachusetts to bondage. That Yankee captain carried his victim back to avoid the payment of a thousand dollars. We asked a Republican Legislature to make it cost him more to carry him back than to let him stay (cheers). And they said, "No; it is unconstitutional, and we should hazard our success in 1860 to make humanity legal in Massachusetts." Now, there is the head and front of our treason. We care nothing for that Constitution. Our object, plainly avowed, is to take this State of ours out of a Union which makes the professedly anti-slavery members of a Republican Legislature obliged by their oaths to allow that act to be done in any guise, with or without formalities. What side do you take in this controversy? How far have you travelled in this Massachusetts groove? How individual and democratic are you? I told you that Massachusetts has been gradually growing to throw off the superstitious regard for ecclesiastical and civil fetters. How much have your minds profited by that progress? How ready are you to join us?

I will tell you, gentlemen, exactly what I count upon. I do not count simply upon the distinct and specific anti-slavery purpose of Massachusetts. I trust partly in the general growth of individuals, and (in its broad and generous sense) *Democratic* independence! Let me tell you what I mean. Last month, there was published in this city a pleasant libel in the form of a dainty volume, called "The Life of Chief-Justice Parsons," written by a man who pretends to be his son, and is, I understand, a professor in Harvard University. Well, that is no very great title! (Laughter.) One such professor murdered his friend lately, and this other has murdered his father (renewed laughter and applause). Of course, I suppose this gentleman imagines that in the statements he makes regarding his father, he is doing him honor. He presents in one chapter the Chief Justice on the bench, and groups there some dozen anecdotes, going to show that Parsons, the worthy old Federalist, the head of the "Essex junto," the model judge, the boast of Massachusetts law, was in fact a Jeffries; that he undertook to tell Otis, and Dexter, and Blake, and Bargess, when he did not think a case deserved to be argued, they should not argue it; made himself, like the man in Hood's comic song, judge, jury and executioner; and threatened to commit Francis Blake if he attempted to address a jury on the evidence when he, the judge, forbade him to do so. Now, of course, this is all false. The poor demented Whig has scraped together the refuse of bar-room talk and old wives' gossip as his idea of history and honorable conduct, and hides his father's brow with such a chaplet of nightshade (loud applause). Chief-Justice Parsons was never half as bad as that; Otis was not a coward; Blake was not a fool; Dexter was not a spaniel; and Burgess was not a puppy (great merriment). But the reason I tell you the story is this: it opens to you the heart of a fossil hunker. It is as good as a specimen for Agassiz, to get at the nature of an extinct race. The writer is an old Whig—an old Winthrop, Fillmore, fossil, Webster, Fugitive Slave bill, Massachusetts politician, smothered and chilled into a Harvard College Professor (laughter and applause), and is endeavoring to compliment and weave a chaplet of laurel for his father. Of course, he wants to make it green and beautiful; only, unconsciously, he paints a Jeffries! That is the muscle of Massachusetts which holds on to the Union. That is the side of Massachusetts that has not learned anything for fifty years. That is the side of Massachusetts that thinks, if there was not the Constitution of '87, Charles River would flow up hill—that we sleep and digest in consequence of James Buchanan's being President, just "as the sun rises because the cock crows" (laughter and applause).

Now, how much have you got away from that type of mind? You do not get away from it necessarily, by being a professed anti-slavery man; you do not get away from it simply by being a Republican. Oh, no! The highest office in the gift of the Republican party of Massachusetts is held to-day, and within our meeting was its incumbent this very day, by a man who did not blush to say, within five years, that if his party got control of the nation, the man who talked disunion in Massachusetts should hang as high as the man who talked disunion in the Carolinas! That is the Republican Senatorship of Massachusetts! It is not necessary that a man who is a Republican should be as blind as that—oh, no! I am only showing you that a man who is a Republican, and is in office, has not necessarily got his eyes open.

What is necessary in order to understand the argument I address to you is this: that you should recognize the fact that a negro is a man, and that all the moral principles which apply to white men apply to him; and that, when the State undertakes to apply them to him, she should apply them with as rigid a loyalty to justice as if his skin were white. Many of you think you have learned that; but you have not. When I say, "A negro is a man," you say, "Of course he is; how foolish to tire us with such a truism as that!" Well, my doubting friend, suppose that negro to-night should cut his master's throat, and burn down his dwelling, what name would you give to him? I would call him George Washington, William Wallace, William Tell, John Hancock, carved in ebony—what would you call him? Does your heart leap and say, "Would to God I too were of the heroic class like him!" or do you cry out, "Fanaticism!" "Insurrection!" "Bloodshed!" "Murder!" Or do you say, "A *nigger* George Washington?" A great deal in that word! William H. Seward understands how much there is in it; for I am told he said, when somebody asked him if Douglas would ever be President, "No, sir; no man will ever be President of the United States who spells 'negro' with two g's" (laughter and rapturous applause). Seward knows that a negro is a man. Seward knows, though I think he dare not say it yet, that the negro is a basis upon which, and for which, it would be honorable to break this Union asunder. That very anecdote which I have told you shows how deep down in the very substratum of the man's moral nature has penetrated the irresistible conviction that the black man has reason enough, in his wrongs and in his chains, by which to weigh and to test the Union itself.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have a petition which we mean to present to the Legislature—a petition which carries out the very idea which I have been endeavoring to set before you. It is a disunion petition—I allow it. It is a petition that sets its right foot on the Constitution of 1787. It says:

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Massachusetts.

The undersigned, citizens of Massachusetts, respectfully ask you to put an end to SLAVE-HUNTING in Massachusetts, by enacting that no person, who has been held as a slave, shall be delivered up, by any officer or court, State or Federal, within this Commonwealth, to any one claiming him on the ground that he owes "service or labor" to such claimant, by the laws of one of the slave States of this Union."

[Mr. Phillips continued to urge, in an earnest appeal, the signing of this petition—repeating with great effect the story of the woman's escape mentioned in his speech at New York, which we printed a few weeks ago. This appeal was listened to in profound silence, and made a marked impression on the audience, which enthusiastically cheered him as he took his seat.]

On Thursday evening, in Mercantile Hall, Mr. Phillips, on taking the platform, after referring to the discussion that had preceded, said:

Allow one word more in regard to the present condition of things in the Commonwealth. I have the pleasure to say, to any one who has not already heard it, that those two men—at least they have that resemblance to humanity, that temptation makes them rascals, and rum makes them drunk (laughter)—I mean that captain and mate who sent a negro back to Norfolk on the 8th day of May, were to-day brought before Judge Russell, and put under bonds of $4,000, to appear before the majesty of Massachusetts law, to show why they kidnapped a man in the blue waters of Massachusetts Bay (loud applause). We shall see how good Massachusetts law is in showing such men that rascality costs more than good conduct. That captain might have had to pay a thousand dollars in Norfolk, Va., if he had not carried back that man. Let us cast up the account on the ledger. He paid $500 to Capt. Bacon, to carry the man back. If he ever gets into the clutches of a Massachusetts jury, he will pay $1,000 fine. Before he reaches that end, however, he must go through the gauntlet of two or three hunker attorneys—I believe the London phrase is—sharks! (Laughter.) They will make him pay some $1,000 or $1,500 more. If he does not pay the fine, he has got to go into the jail of Massachusetts for a year. We must not put that down as a loss; he will get into quite respectable company when he gets there (laughter and applause); and if he does not go there, he will go into the State prison for any time short of ten years. In that case, you will hear our friend, John A. Andrew, moving for a *habeas corpus* before Judge Shaw, at the instance of some murderer confined in the prison, on the ground that cruel and unusual punishments are not constitutional, and he has been put into a cell next to that of a brutal kidnapper from Cape Cod (loud cheering). At any rate, we will try what vigor there is in Massachusetts law to appeal to that only muscle which a Cape Cod captain of this stripe has—his money—and show him that it would have been a paying business if he had saved that man, instead of sacrificing him. Until we get a Church and a moral sense to create hearts that respond to humanity, we must make this base and lower appeal to the self-interest of certain parties in the Commonwealth. I would rather see that Capt. Crowell, of the brig Rolerson, in the State Prison for seven years, for the crime of having sent back a negro from the blue waters of the Bay that laves Cape Cod on its southern side, than forty Wilsons in the Senate, or a hundred Sumners in the Presidential chair; for when Massachusetts shall do that, South Carolina will hush her babies with the name of Massachusetts. I want a better triumph than a Massachusetts Senator; I want a Massachusetts sinner in our State Prison (applause). Yes, I stood here this afternoon, and if I had not been unwilling to interrupt the speaker, I should have moved three cheers for Old England, when that colored man Jones told us that, as he was paddling his craft from the passing boat-man, he caught sight of the English jack. "I knew it," he said. Of course he knew it; he knew nothing else. He had not learned anything but the shape of the cross. Is it not worth living and dying for, worth all the Hampdens and Sydneys, Vanes and Miltons for a thousand years, to build up a beaming flag that, whenever the eye of the oppressed sees it, in any quarter of the globe, he clasps it as binding him to the throne of God, and feels safe under its folds? (Loud applause.) I want the Massachusetts flag to be just such an one, that every bondman in the Carolinas, if he know nothing more, shall know the mailed arm of the State; and when he sees it, no matter what power there is about it, no matter how threatening the storm on men's faces, he will feel that if a man but places his foot under the broad banner of the old infidel Commonwealth of Massachusetts, he is certain to be safe (prolonged cheering). That will be a country to be loved; that will be a country for another Cowper to sing, in a nobler strain even than he did the praises of England herself.

Take these men, and teach them the Gospel through the stone walls of the State Prison, and I will make a banner of the red and blue trowsers of Capt. Crowell when he comes out, after seven years in the workshop of that prison, for the crime of having forgotten that a negro was a man, and it will be a nobler banner than Massachusetts would bear if she carried the motto of Sydney through the battle and the breeze for a thousand years. We have got the matter into the courts. It is possible we may find a Massachusetts jury who will be able to know its duty in this emergency; it is possible we may find on the bench worthy descendants of the Holts on the other side of the water. We will try what pluck there is in law, as we have found none in the Christianity of this Commonwealth. Cape Cod! Shovel her off into the ocean rather than have her the scene of such outrages as these. Why, had that fugitive slave looked across the sandy Cape, he might have heard the echo of the waves that break on the sad grave of Webster! Whigs of Massachusetts, prove now the claim you make for his memory! He might almost have caught a glimpse of the rising monument at Plymouth. Make it a shelter for fugitives from a direr oppression than the pilgrim ever defied.

I have not time to say more (loud calls of "go on," "go on"). But I think it is a glorious hour. Ten years ago, or more, the same scene was enacted in Boston harbor. You remember that boy. He swam half way to South Boston, then was caught, and John H. Pearson's captain shut him up in the cabin, and took him back to his master. Pearson told it in State street. We had a meeting in Faneuil Hall. John Quincy Adams presided, Stephen C. Phillips made the opening speech, and said this conduct of the Long wharf merchant was a libel on the merchants of Boston. The next day, Pearson met him on State street, and said, "Take a vote at high 'change, and I will have ten merchants to say I did right to one man that you can get in State street to call it disgraceful." Charles Francis Adams said then, "We will have a grand jury indict these men before the Superior Court, and show Carolina the Christianity of Massachusetts." They called me to the platform to follow him. I was not in the programme. I said, "I take the liberty to doubt whether you will find in your country a grand jury with hearts brave enough to lay the little finger of their rebuke on the base merchant of Long wharf." The case went to the grand jury, but you never heard of it afterwards. John H. Pearson walked State street, and gloried in the indorsement State street had given him. John Quincy Adams went home, having left his testimony that justice was a shadow; but there was no echo in the streets of Boston to his eloquence.

Twelve years have passed away. We have had these meetings. The great incubus of Webster, God has taken off of the Commonwealth's heart, and it begins to beat. They have concealed him in a mass of ugly iron, and the Republicans have forgotten self-respect, and given it a place in front of the Capitol. He is dead, and we will ask that his influence may soon die also. Twelve years have passed away, and great hearts have begun to beat. A Cape Cod captain cannot do to-day, I think (I may be wrong), what John H. Pearson did twelve years ago. I think a grand jury will find a court for him; I believe a petit jury will find a verdict. I do not know, but I take a Yankee's privilege, and guess. I hope if any course shall take the case up to our Supreme Bench, our old chief will hide that ugly chain which was round the court-house, and beneath which he bowed—hide the shadow which will everlastingly rest upon his person, and which history will not fail to save with the green laurel, in the last years of his chief justiceship, of a verdict against a kidnapper, with the utmost penalty of the statute, and so crown his judicial life with the *Plaudite* of the Roman actor, and go out with the gratitude of a million of Massachusetts men (loud applause).

REMARKS BY MR. GARRISON.

MR. GARRISON did not think it necessary to answer the charges made against the Anti-Slavery Society, but would simply say they were all false, unjust, and entirely uncalled for. The Anti-Slavery cause had never gone back, never wavered. The Republican party was not claimed as a party designed to abolish slavery, and no anti-slavery man supposed that it was, yet it was true, as a side issue, no person dared at the South avow himself as friendly to it, nor could any Republican find safety or favor there. To compare such a party with one that avowedly sustains slavery, and is sustained by the Slave Power, is manifestly unjust. The Old Bay State was clearly the Republican State, and it contained within it the greatest amount of intelligence and of disunion sentiment. It could not be said that the Anti-Slavery sentiment was due to the Democratic party, but the sentiment had made the Republican party. Under the old Whig party, so long as that party remained intact, North and South, the anti-slavery element in it did not cause a ripple at the South.

Then the struggle for the freedom of the territories took place—the Whig party went down, and the Republican party which succeeded it gallantly beat back the invaders of freedom, having divided the North from the South politically—the first instance of the kind since the formation of the government. It had virtually dissolved the Union—at least to that extent—although the party did not acknowledge the fact.

In reference to Dr. Cheever, Mr. Garrison thought he was bearing some highly effective testimonies, and exhibiting a good deal of moral courage and endurance; yet he blamed him for not being as consistent and vigilant in anti-slavery matters as he was in heresy-hunting. In regard to an abstract theological dogma, he was not only swift to condemn, but also to execute judgment, to enforce discipline, and to withdraw Christian fellowship, while in regard to the sin of all sins, slavery, he resorted neither to excision nor secession, but was disposed to hold on, as in the case of the American Tract Society, for the purpose of having "another fight." To be consistent, he should make the pro-slavery evangelical Church and its auxiliaries walk overboard.

THE goodness of people around us is not all a mask. There is a great deal that is as the sounding brass and the tinkling cymbal; but, God be thanked, there is a great deal that is true, sweet music, with the rest of it. I believe, in fact, that those men who seem to us the worst, seem worse than they really are. I believe that the man who has stood before his fellow-men as the worst man, is conceived by them to be worse than he really is. I believe there is some vein of light in the darkest heart, some extenuating incidents in the basest life.—*E. H. Chapin.*

EVERYBODY sits in judgment on a dirty sin, but clean it, dress it, and polish it, and there are ten thousand people who think it is not so sinful after all. It is ragged iniquity that is sinful; burnished iniquity is not quite so wicked as men think.—*H. W. Beecher.*

LETTER FROM REV. HENRY T. CHEEVER.

Secretary of the Church Anti-Slavery Society.

(WITH NOTES, IN REPLY, BY C. K. W.)

To the Editor of The Liberator.

IN the rejoicder of C. K. W. to my last communication "the distinctively Christian character of the Church Anti-Slavery Society," I see but two things that require notice; first, alleged inaccuracy in the use of the words Church and Christian; second, the alleged superiority of an anti-slavery organization that admits to its communion all friends of the slave, whether Christian or infidel, to an organization intended to include only the Christian friends of the slaves, or those embraced within the visible Church.

In regard to the first, I deny and disprove the inaccuracy, by showing that the language used—"There has not been until now any distinctively Christian or Church organization against slavery"—could not mean anything else than that it is the first anti-slavery organization that has existed, both founded on *Christian principles* and to be composed exclusively of *Christian persons.* The American Anti-Slavery Society, though founded on a Christian basis as to its principles, is meant to include all friends of the slave, whether Christian or infidel, of all creeds or no creed, in the visible Church or out of it. The Church Anti-Slavery Society is a distinctively Christian or Church organization, because it is both on a strictly Christian basis and is, by the terms of its Constitution, intended to include *Christians only,* and to be the organ or exponent of the Church. (1) This was [illegible] and implied many times over in the [illegible] the erroneous report of which has caused the controversy. And it is both expressed and implied in the Preamble, Declaration of Principles and Constitution. This makes the chief if not the only difference between the American Anti-Slavery Society and the Church Anti-Slavery Society.

2. As to the second thing to be noticed, viz., the alleged superiority of an anti-slavery organization that admits to its communion *all friends of the slave* to an organization intended to include *only the Christian friends of the slave,* or those embraced within the visible Church, it is merely a matter of opinion. (2.) In the view of some, the union of all friends of the slave in the same organization is an advantage. In the view of others, it is a disadvantage. I see no reason why a man who is a Christian and a church-member could not belong to both. But it is clear that one of the Societies only can represent the Church. (3.)

In this connection, allow me to answer a question put by your correspondent C. K. W. in his review of a "Tract for the Times on the question, Is it right to withhold fellowship from Churches or from individuals that tolerate or practise slavery?" He quotes the following passage from that Tract: "What will become of our religious organizations when irreligious men get ahead of the Church in morals, and in the practical work of Christianity? In some instances, they are already a long ways ahead of the very oracles of orthodoxy." C. K. W. then asks the writer distinctly to say who are meant in this; and if certain persons are meant, to designate anything irreligious in their anti-slavery action.

Now, in answer to these questions, I would say, first, that the fact to be noticed and my own idea of it would have been more accurately expressed if, instead of the term "irreligious men," I had said, men not religious. For this was all I meant; that is, men who do not embrace Christianity as contained in the inspired Word of God; men who do not hold to the Divine Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, and who do not unite with any of the visible organizations of the Christian Church, but stand aloof, or come out from them. Webster defines irreligion to be a want of religion. (4.) An irreligious or a non-religious man will then be a man wanting in religion. In my use of the word, he is also a man who does not sympathize or have fellowship with any of the religious orders or sects of religion, but not necessarily that he is either an atheist or an infidel.

Now, what I intended to say was, that when men without any profession of Christianity, who stand apart from the Church, and who deny perhaps the authority of the Scriptures as containing the inspired rule for man's faith and practice, are above and beyond the Church in their morals, and in the practical duties of Christianity toward their fellow-men, especially toward the weak and the oppressed, there is danger to the Church of being cast into contempt. (5.) The context of the passage quoted, and the note appended, make the meaning of the writer entirely clear.

In answer, then, to the question, who are meant, or what persons, in this passage, I say distinctly, men like Pillsbury, Wright, Foster and Parker, who are understood to denounce the modern Christian Church (6) and to deny the peculiar inspiration and authority of the Christian Scriptures and of Christian ordinances. In answer to the request that I will have the kindness to designate anything irreligious in their anti-slavery action, I frankly say that I am unable to do so, unless it be that the apparent asperity and bitterness with which they conduct the anti-slavery warfare, and the occasional flings in which they indulge against the received Christianity of the Bible, may be called *irreligious,* in the sense of being *contrary to religion, and contemptuous of it.*

With their philanthropy I agree, and I mourn that the very oracles of orthodoxy are so far behind them in the practical duties of Christianity toward the slave, and that they, stigmatized as irreligious or infidel, are so far in advance of the recognized organs and exponents of the Church, in the advocacy of the rights of man, and of practical righteousness and freedom. (7.) I love the slave as they do, and I love the Church also as they do not. It is from duty to God and love to man that I am an Abolitionist. It is from duty to Christ the Head, and from love to the Church as His body (8), that we are laboring through the Church Anti-Slavery Society "to place the Christian Church in its true position. (9.) We would not merely absolve it from all complicity with American slavery, but we would take away its reproach of remaining silent and inactive in the presence of this giant crime of the day. It is not fitting that the Church should ignore her responsibilities in this matter. Her ministry and membership are neither honoring their Master nor promoting their own good report by leaving this question—essentially a MORAL one, involving in all its parts the great principles of *right* and *wrong,* the duties we owe to God, our fellow-men, and our own souls—to be discussed and decided by skeptical reformers, made more skeptical by her remissness, or by politicians, looking at it merely as an element of party arrangement and zeal. Such a question is not safe in such hands. The issues involved are too momentous to be lodged exclusively with them, or with any political party, however correct, in the main, its principles and platform may be. Nor is it safe, or for the honor of the Church (10) to allow such a question to be decided, even if it could be, by worldly men from worldly principles alone. For her own sake, her testimony should be unequivocal, and her position clearly defined. Her hold upon the confidence and conscience of the community requires it. She would diminish the numbers who are yearly swelling the ranks of modern skepticism, she must change what seems to many the equivocal position she now occupies upon this subject; and thus deprive infidelity of one of its most effective weapons, and one that it is using with the most terrible success."*

With these statements, it does not seem to me necessary or desirable to pursue this controvery any further. Both Societies are prosecuting the same great end, and it will take all the energy and resources of both to accomplish it. I see no reason why the two should not work harmoniously together. (11.) But they cannot coalesce. Neither any more can one supersede the other. The friends and advocates of the one may appear upon the public platform of the other without compromise; and there need be nought but a generous and kindly rivalry between them in the service of the slave. That ultimate success is sure, in the warfare with oppression, to a faithful Ministry and a witnessing Church (12), we of the Church Anti-Slavery Society do firmly hold; and let us, so agreed,

> "Prayer-strengthened for the trial, come together,
> Put on the harness for the moral fight,
> And with the blessing of our Heavenly Father,
> MAINTAIN THE RIGHT."

Jewett City, Conn., May 15, 1859. H. T. C.

(1.) This sentence seems to me to contain a contradiction in terms. *The* Church, in this country, is a pro-slavery Church, is the great bulwark of slavery. A Society, therefore, composed of Christians only, and acting on Christian principles, cannot possibly be the organ or exponent of the Church. It seems to me absurd for *such* a Society to pretend or desire to be the organ of *such* a Church; and it seems to me certain that, if such a Society acts up to its profession of Christianity, the Church in the United States will meet it with active opposition, whenever its numbers and its influence shall have so increased as to occasion any feeling beyond indifference. But if, when H. T. C. uses the word "Church," he means sometimes the Church of Christ, and sometimes that conglomeration of sects, calling themselves "evangelical," which make up our tract and missionary Societies, and if he keeps shifting from one of these opposite meanings to the other, there can be very little use in arguing with him.

(2.) If an intelligent slave were asked whether *all* men should oppose slavery, or only all Christian men—and whether slavery should receive absolute and unconditional opposition, or only such amount of opposition as should be compatible with the credit, prosperity and enlargement of the American Church—I think his "opinion" upon both these points would be quickly formed and energetically expressed.

(3.) It is clear that the Society of which H. T. C. is the Secretary does *not* represent that Church in America which calls itself evangelical. Why then say that it *does?*

(4.) It is unfortunate that H. T. C. had not time to read through the whole of Webster's definition, which is as follows:

"IRRELIGION.—Want of religion, or contempt of it; impiety."

I think the word is commonly used in the latter of these two senses; but since Webster decides that it may mean either, and since the former sense is *all that* H. T. C. *meant,* it is again unfortunate, very unfortunate, that he used such an ambiguous word.

If you throw a stone at a negro, a Jew, or any unpopular person, *in a place where it is customary to throw stones at such persons*—and say, in reply to his remonstrance, "My dear sir, I meant to throw only a snow-ball"—to be sure, this explanation is better than throwing another stone, but it does not make the transaction a satisfactory one; and if he should proceed to ask why you wished to throw even a snow-ball at him, I do not know what you could say in defence of even *so far* putting yourself on the side of injustice.

(5.) Danger! indeed! Why does not H. T. C. say there is *hope* that the Church will be cast into contempt, when she so richly deserves it?

How often must I repeat that the Church *of Christ* is NEVER surpassed "in the practical duties of Christianity," either by irreligious or unreligious men. That the *American* Church, which calls itself "evangelical," is so often thus surpassed by both these classes, is only another conclusive proof that it is *not* the Church of Christ; and if it is not, why is H. T. C. so solicitous to defend it?

(6.) Then they are *misunderstood;* which is strange, considering that no men have ever spoken more directly and perspicuously. The wish has certainly been father to the thought in those who, *knowing what they have really said,* make this representation of it. The thing which these persons have denounced, and most justly, is the modern unchristian Church, the great bulwark of slavery.

The phraseology of H. T. C. in this statement shows him conscious of its unsoundness. A grave accusation ought not to be based upon mere rumor—the statement that somebody, some unnamed person, understood it so; and, therefore, I now ask him, did *he* ever hear either of the persons whom he has stigmatized above say one syllable against any church that *has* faithfully performed its Christian duties to the slave in the South, and to the colored people in the North? When he has answered this, it will be quite time enough to take up the theological dogmas with which he has pieced out his accusation, as well as the insinuation of "apparent" asperity towards a "received" Christianity.

---

*Circular addressed by the Executive Committee of the Church Anti-Slavery Society to Christian ministers and church-members.

THE OBERLIN HABEAS CORPUS.

DECISION OF THE OHIO SUPREME COURT.

From The Columbus State Journal, May 31.

THE decision of the Supreme Court, in the application for a discharge of Bushnell and Langston, convicted of a violation of the Fugitive Slave act, at the recent term of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, was announced yesterday afternoon, all the Judges being present. The decision of a majority of the Court—namely, Chief-Justice Swan, and Judges Scott and Peck—was against the prayer of the relators. Judges Brinkerhoff and Sutliff dissented from the majority of the Court.

Whatever may be the conflicting popular opinions upon the decision rendered by a majority of the Court, the people of Ohio will doubtless regard it as the deliberate judgment of the highest tribunal of the State, and will respect it accordingly.

We give below a synopsis of Judge Swan's opinion. We had hoped to have given the opinion entire in this issue of our paper, but it was retained by Judge Swan for revision. The synopsis, however, presents the main points:

JUDGE SWAN'S OPINION.

Judges Swan, Scott and Peck held:

I. That the provisions of art. 4, section 2, of the Constitution of the United States, "No person held to service or labor in one State under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due," guarantees to the owner of an escaped slave the right of reclamation.

II. That a citizen who knowingly and intentionally interferes with, for the purpose of rescue or rescues from the owners, an escaped slave, is guilty of a violation of the Constitution of the United States, whether the acts of 1793 and 1850, commonly called the Fugitive Slave laws, are unconstitutional or not.

III. That the question in this case is not whether the Fugitive Slave act of 1850 is unconstitutional in respect to the appointment and powers of commissioners, the allowance of a writ of habeas corpus, the mode of reclamation, &c., but whether Congress has any power to pass any law whatever, however just and proper in its provisions, for the reclamation of slaves, or to protect the owner of an escaped slave from interference when duly asserting his constitutional rights of reclamation.

IV. That Congress, from the earliest period of the Government, has, by legislative penalties, vindicated the constitutional right of the owner of slaves against unlawful interference.

V. That such legislation was adopted in 1793 by the IId Congress elected under the Constitution, composed of many of the members of the Convention who framed the Constitution; has, from that day to this, been acquiesced in by all departments of the Government, National and State; and the legislative power of Congress on this subject has been *recognized* by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio in their statutes; by the Supreme Court of the United States, and by the Supreme Courts of Massachusetts, New-York, Pennsylvania, Indiana, Illinois, California, by the Supreme Court of Ohio on the circuit, and, indeed, by the Supreme Court of every State in the Union where the question has been made, and has never been denied by the Supreme Court of any State—the Courts of Wisconsin, notwithstanding the popular impression, not forming an exception.

VI. The right to rescue escaped slaves from their owners being denied to all citizens of the United States by the Constitution; Congress having prohibited it and enforced the prohibition by penalties; the Supreme Court of the United States and Courts of the Free States having recognized and acquiesced in such legislative prohibition and punishment, if the question is not thus put beyond the reach of the private personal views of Judges, and if they possess judicial discretion or power to overrule on the authority of their individual opinions this unbroken current of decisions, and this acquiescence of the States of the Union, and change the settled interpretation of the Constitution of the United States, then there is no limit and no restraint upon Judges making at any time, and under any circumstances, their own individual opinions arbitrary interpreters of the Constitution.

VII. Whatever differences of opinion may now exist in the public mind, as to the power of Congress to punish rescues as provided in the acts of 1793 and 1850, no such vital blow is given either to constitutional rights or State sovereignty by Congress thus enacting a law to punish a violation of the Constitution of the United States as to demand of this Court the organization of resistance. If, after more than sixty years of acquiescence by all departments of the National and State Governments, in the power of Congress to provide for the punishment of rescuers of escaped slaves, that power is to be disregarded and all laws which may be passed by Congress on this subject from henceforth are to be persistently resisted and nullified, the work of revolution should not be begun by the conservators of the public peace.

Judge Scott orally assented to the foregoing, as embodying his views, especially in its conclusions; although he intimated that he would, in a written opinion, modify some of the details.

Judge Peck delivered an elaborate written opinion, coinciding with Judges Swan and Scott, comprising a review of the decisions of the Courts, and particularly of the State Courts, upon the questions involved in the case, and treating the whole matter as a *res adjudicata.*

Judge Sutliff also read a dissenting opinion, taking the ground that, according to the established rules of construction, no authority for Congress to pass the Fugitive Act could be found in the Constitution.

Judge Brinkerhoff also dissented from

in each State to the public acts, records and judicial proceedings of every other State. *And the Congress may by general laws prescribe the manner in which such acts, records and proceedings shall be proved, and the effect thereof.*" Here, in the first place, is a compact between the States respectively—an agreement of the several States to and with each other, that the "public acts, records and judicial proceedings" of each shall have "full faith and credit" given to them in all. Had this section closed here, would any one claim that it embraced any grant of legislative power to Congress? I think not. But the framers of the Constitution thought that Congress ought to have the power "to prescribe the manner in which such acts, records and proceedings should be proved, and the effect thereof"; and hence they gave the power in express terms. When they intended a grant of power to Congress, and not a mere contract stipulation by or injunction of duty upon the States, *they say so*, and leave us no room for cavil on the subject. But let us go on.

SEC. 2. "The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States."

"A person charged in any State with treason, felony or other crime, who shall flee from justice, and be found in another State, shall, on demand of the Executive authority of the State from which he fled, be delivered up, to be removed to the State having jurisdiction of the crime."

That these clauses of section two are mere articles of compact between the States, dependent on the good faith of the States alone for their fulfilment, I suppose no one will dispute. They do not confer upon Congress any power whatsoever to enforce their observance. Then follows the last clause of section two, in respect to fugitives from labor or service, first quoted. And this, like all the other preceding clauses of this article, except the first, is destitute of any grant of power, or even allusion to Congress or the Federal Government. Now, if a grant of power to Congress was here intended, why this silence? If the framers of the Constitution intended a grant of power to Congress in this clause, why did they not say so, as they did say in the first section, in respect to "public acts, records and judicial proceedings"?

It seems to me that no rational answer can be given to this question, except by a denial of such intention. *Expressio unius exclusio alterius*, is a legal maxim as old as the common law. The express mention of one thing implies the exclusion of things not mentioned. It is the dictate of reason and common sense. It is a maxim which applies alike in the interpretation of contracts, statutes and constitutions. Its application was never more obviously proper than to the question before us; and when applied, it seems to me to bring with it a force little short of mathematical demonstration.

Thus far I have reasoned as if we were ignorant of the history of the Constitution. But a glance at that history confirms the conclusions to which we are brought by the ordinary rules of interpretation, and makes "assurance doubly sure."

The Articles of Confederation under which the struggle for independence was carried through, and for which the present Constitution of the United States is a substitute, contained *nothing but* articles of compact. The fulfilment of its obligations was dependent upon the faith of the States alone. The Congress could make requisitions, but had no power to enforce them.

Again: Certain provisions of the ordinance of 1787, for the government of the territory north-west of the Ohio river, were in express terms declared to be "articles of compact."

Now, every one of the clauses of the fourth article of the Constitution above quoted were borrowed and transferred, with but slight verbal alterations, from the Articles of Confederation and the Ordinance of 1787—the first three from the former, and the last from the latter—with this exception only, that to the first of these clauses was added a grant of power to Congress to prescribe the manner of proof and effect of public acts, records and judicial proceedings. Here, then, we have certain articles of compact—admitted or declared to be such, and nothing more—borrowed and transferred from one instrument to another, with no intimation of any change of their character as articles of compact, except in a single instance where the charge is expressly declared. The inference seems to me to be irresistible that, except so far as the charge is expressly declared, they remained, after the transfer, the same as they were before—articles of compact, and nothing else.

I conclude, therefore, that the States are bound, in fulfilment of their plighted faith, and through the medium of *their* laws, legislation and functionaries, to deliver up the fugitive from service or labor, on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due under the laws of another State from which the fugitive has fled. But the Federal Government has nothing to do with the subject, and its interference is sheer usurpation of a power not granted, but reserved.

But it is said the question is settled, and our argument comes too late. I deny that it is settled.

The federal legislature has usurped a power not granted by the Constitution, and a federal judiciary has, through the medium of reasonings lame, halting, contradictory, and of far-fetched implications, derived from unwarranted assumptions and false history, sanctioned the usurpation. I deny that the decisions of a usurping party in favor of the validity of its own assumptions can settle anything. It is true that the courts and legislatures of several of the States have decided in the same way; but they have been decisions of acquiescence rather than of original and independent inquiry. The fact that such jurists as Hornblower, Walworth and Webster thought on this subject as I think shows that the question is not settled. The fact that a majority of my brethren, as I understand them, admit that if this were a new question they would be with me, and that they yield the strong leanings of their own minds to the force of the rule of *res adjudicata* alone, proves that this question is not settled. The truth is, it is not till recently that the mass of intelligent and inquiring mind in this country has been brought to bear upon this question. It required the enactment and enforcement of the Fugitive Slave act of 1850, overriding the most sacred and fundamental guarantees of the Constitution, and disregarding in its provisions even the decencies of legislation, as if for the very purpose of irritation and humiliation, and the fine and imprisonment under it of *white* men for the exercise of the instinctive virtues of humanity, to awaken general inquiry. That inquiry is now going forward. And so surely as the matured conviction of the mass of intelligent mind in this country must ultimately control the operations of Government in all its departments, so surely is this question not settled. When it is settled right, then it will be settled, and not till then.

But, cotemporaneous construction is appealed to. I admit its weight, and its title to respectful consideration. But cotemporaneous construction speaks with a divided voice. It is true that Congress, as early as 1793, legislated for the return of fugitives from labor. But nearly if not quite every one of the old States had also legislated on the same subject in fulfilment of what they deemed a matter of constitutional obligation resting on them. And such legislation on the part of the States, old and new, continued until the Supreme Court of the United States, in the Prigg case, as late as 1842 (16 Peters, 539), assumed for the Federal Government exclusive authority over the subject. And those who appealed to cotemporaneous construction should themselves respect it. From the foundation of the government until within the last ten years, Congress claimed and exercised, without question, full and complete legislative power over the Territories of the United States; and as early as 1828, in American Insurance Company agt. Canters (1 Peters, 546), the Supreme Court of the United States, Chief-Justice Marshall delivering its opinion, unanimously decided that in the Territories Congress rightfully exercises the "combined powers of the General and of a State Government." Yet in the recent case of Dred Scott agt. Sandford (19 Howard, 393), all this is overturned and disregarded, and the whole past theory and practice of the government in this respect attempted to be revolutionized by force of a judicial *ipse dixit*. We are thus invited by that Court back to the consideration of first principles; and neither it nor those who rely on its authority have a right to complain if we accept the invitation.

I know of no way other than through the action of the State governments in which the reserved rights and powers of the States can be preserved, and the guarantees of individual liberty be vindicated. The history of this country, brief as it is, already shows that the federal judiciary is never behind the other departments of that government, and most foremost, in the assumption of non granted powers. And let it be finally yielded that the Federal Government is, in the last resort, the authoritative judge of the extent of its own powers, and the reservations and limitations of the Constitution which the framers of that instrument so jealously endeavored firmly to fix and guard will soon be, if they are not already, obliterated; and that government, the sole possessor of the only means of revenue in the employment of which the people can be kept ignorant of the extent of their own burdens, and with its overshadowing patronage, attracting to its support the ambitious by means of its honors, and the mercenary through the medium of its emoluments, will speedily become, if it be not already, practically omnipotent.

These were my opinions, freely declared, for years before I had the honor of a seat on this bench; and, having learned nothing during the pendency of these cases to change, but much to confirm them, I know no reason why I should hesitate to avow them now.

I give my voice in favor of the discharge of the relators.

I THINK we are in great danger of tergiversation, and miserable, petty indirections in morals. The want of manly honor, of simple, truth-speaking honor, of fair-dealing honor, of upright, conscientious honor—the want of that fairness which we find among the men of the world, is painfully felt in matters of religion. These ecclesiastical morals!—nothing in the world is more detestable. Christian morals are manly morals, and there are none others.—*H. W. Beecher.*

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

WITHOUT CONCEALMENT—WITHOUT COMPROMISE.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JUNE 11, 1859.

CORRESPONDENTS will greatly oblige us by a careful observance of the following directions, viz.:

Letters enclosing matter for publication, or relating in any way to the editorial conduct of the paper, should be addressed, "*Editor of the Anti-Slavery Standard, No. 5 Beekman street, New York.*"

Letters enclosing subscriptions, or relating in any way to the business of the office, should be addressed, "*Publisher of the Anti Slavery Standard, No. 5 Beekman street, New York.*"

THE TRACT SOCIETY AT BOSTON.

IN a volume which is everywhere found in this country except in the huts of the slave—a volume much read and much praised, yet the name of which is valued beyond its contents, and the poorer part of its contents far beyond the higher and nobler, by the majority of those who read it—we find mention made of "the glorious liberty of the children of God." And other declarations, testimonies and precepts, scattered among the very various contents of that library in one volume, express the great importance of liberty. The following are a few of them.

"Proclaim liberty throughout all the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof."

"The Lord hath sent me . . . to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound."

"Thus saith the Lord—Ye have not hearkened unto me in proclaiming liberty, every one to his brother, and every man to his neighbor."

"Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty."

"Stand fast, therefore, in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage."

"Brethren, ye have been called unto liberty."

Morever, that Jesus, whose name is constantly taken in vain on Sundays and other days, by the clergy of the pro-slavery American Church, declared himself especially sent and commissioned to preach the gospel of liberty; to bring to the poor, the oppressed, the chained and the imprisoned a message so joyful as to be appropriately called Gospel, glad tidings. And he made the following emphatic declaration to the people of his own city, Nazareth, even in the hearing of those who held them in degrading bonds of superstition, and laid heavy and grievous burdens upon them:

"The Spirit of the Lord is upon me,
Because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor!
He hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted,
To preach deliverance to the captives,
To set at liberty them that are bruised."

The Pilgrim Fathers of New England held liberty in so high esteem that they first left their native country to seek it, and afterwards threw off the dominion of that country to retain it. But, in a newspaper of this city which claims to teach, with eminent faithfulness and in eminent purity, the doctrines of those Pilgrim Fathers—in the *New York Observer* of a recent date* we find this astonishing statement respecting that very Jesus whose appeal, above quoted, in favor of liberty, caused him to be seized on the spot, regardless of the customary decorum of the synagogue and of the Jewish Sabbath, and violently thrust out of the city:

"Jesus Christ, the Great Reformer, and the Exemplar of all Reformers, came to a people who had been despoiled of their rights, but he never said one word about asserting them. . . . And if he were now a travelling preacher in the United States of America . . . he would not be found going about the Churches and stirring up strife and dissensions; nor getting up conventions to assert the rights of man nor of woman; nor disturbing the harmony of a great religious anniversary like the American Tract Society with clamor about the rights of man."

This statement is found in the leading editorial article of that half of the *Observer's* double sheet which is labelled "RELIGIOUS DEPARTMENT," and which it presents to the community as matter appropriate for Sunday reading.

Having presented this theory of rights, the *Observer* gives (still in the "Religious Department") the following specimen of appropriate "Christian" practice under it. This occurs in a letter "from a veteran missionary," Rev. B. C. Meigs, who has been for more than forty years in the service of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, and whose main object in writing seems to have been to favor slavery, and to praise the piety of those clergymen who support it. The letter contains some particulars respecting a colored woman who knew so little of Christianity as to attend Rev. Dr. Smyth's church in Charleston, S. C., with the expectation of hearing it preached there. It says—

"Many years ago, while a slave, she was married to an Irishman, who acquired a decent little property in Charleston. He soon purchased her freedom, and they were both members of the Church. Though her husband sat with the white congregation below, she showed her humility by cheerfully taking her seat, according to the custom of the city, with her colored sisters, in the gallery. She has always maintained a very consistent Christian character."

Such is the view presented by this "veteran missionary," and equally by the whole policy of the *Observer*, in regard to the relation of Christianity to human rights and to individual liberty. What wonder that the forty-two years which Mr. Meigs has spent in pretending to preach the Gospel in Ceylon have brought forth such very meagre fruit, if his sympathies with *caste* are so strong that he must needs volunteer his open approval of it, and fraternize with the practical supporters of it, as soon as he returns to this country! What wonder that the American Board insist that their Mission Churches shall remain open to slaveholders! What wonder that the Churches of this city practically uphold *caste* as strongly as any heathen body of worshippers in Ceylon! And what wonder that in Boston (where this immemorial custom has been somewhat disturbed by the "notions" there prevalent outside the Church in regard to human rights) some Churches of the popular faith—like Rev. Andrew L. Stone's in Park st., and Rev. Baron Stow's in Chauncy st.—have brought special church laws to the aid of "the custom of the city," of banishing their colored members to seats "in the gallery"! These things are not strange. But some persons may consider it strange that the Boston Tract Society, which is now rapidly gaining funds and auxiliaries, immediately after having taken a ground of distinction from the New York Society (and, as it would seem at first sight, in consequence of dissent from its pro-slavery action), should choose the ministers of pro-slavery Churches upon its own Executive Committee. In fact, the position of this quasi-reformatory Tract Society on one hand, and that of the "Church Anti-Slavery Society" on the other, illustrate, as well as Dr. Smyth's Charleston congregation itself, how thoroughly the American Church has identified itself with slavery.

The Boston Tract Society has at last formally voted to separate itself from the New York one, and the agents and editorial supporters of the former can henceforth say truly that which through the past year they have been saying falsely in regard to this point. The following facts in regard to this Society will show its position, both in regard to the system of slavery and to that not less important point, the stigma of *caste*, which Church and State combine to fasten upon the entire colored population of this country.

1. At the annual meeting of the Boston Tract Society one year ago (a meeting so violent, clamorous and disorderly as to have been characterized by Dr. Humphrey and others as worse than the riotous New York meeting of a fortnight before) the opposers of the New York Society had a clear majority, and carried every measure precisely as they wished.

2. Having thus the power of reorganizing the government entirely in their own hands, they chose to dismiss only the Secretary, and retained all those other members of the government who had, up to that time, harmoniously coöperated with that Secretary in sustaining the New York policy.

3. Having entirely in their own hands the power of adopting a rule of thorough and hearty opposition to slavery, they chose to adopt instead, at the annual meeting aforesaid, the compromising, double-faced, self-stultifying set of resolutions reported by the Committee of Fifteen, and adopted by the New York Society; and they quoted, and reaffirmed, with special emphasis, the fourth resolution of this series, which contained the most disgraceful of its compromises, namely: that, making no pledge of *opposition*, either to slavery itself or to any vice included in it, they would *discuss*, in a spirit fraternal to the slaveholder, those moral duties which grow out of the existence of slavery, and those moral evils and vices which it is known to promote, with the following exceptions: that they would preserve absolute silence upon any wrong, however great, which should be done to the slaves by the President of the United States, or any member of his cabinet, or by the Supreme Court of the United States, or by any officer of the army or navy, or by the Congress of the United States, or any member of it, or by the Governors of the several States, or their Legislatures, or any member of either, or by any political party, or any prominent member of it, or by any candidate for the Presidency, or for membership in Congress, or in any State Legislature.

4. Through the whole of the past year, they have taken special pains to advertise themselves as opposed to the abolition of slavery.

5. Having it perfectly in their power, at the last annual meeting (just held), to choose a board of officers disposed to go as far against slavery as the above compromising rules would allow, they elected the same board, consisting of the very persons who have always favored the policy of the New York Society; except that some of the most pro-slavery of them, including the President, John Tappan, Esq., the first Vice-President, Right Rev. Manton Eastburn, D.D., and, from the Executive Committee, Rev. Dr. Baron Stow and another, had formally withdrawn their names, and declined reëlection; so that the non-election of these persons is in no degree owing to good principle on the part of the Society, but proceeds merely from their own refusal to remain in such company.

6. Though the withdrawal of these few persons by no means accounts for the contrast between the quietness, decorum and almost unanimity of this year's meeting and the tumult and uproar which last year seemed equally shared between a decided majority and a large and energetic minority, another fact thoroughly accounts for it. The course of the majority, and that of the administration which it had unanimously reëlected, had shown, through the whole of the past year, such an unexpected willingness to let slavery alone, and such a heartiness in disclaiming anti-slavery, alike in word and deed—and the omission thus given was so strongly corroborated by the character of the three publications which comprised their year's stock upon that subject (one not mentioning slavery, another favoring it, and the third opposing its immediate abolition)—that the minority saw plainly that there was no cause either for dissatisfaction or opposition upon their part; they were very well satisfied to have a large increase of funds and members to the Boston Society; and they saw that the party in power had no disposition to meddle with slavery one inch beyond the point of establishing, in the popular mind, the idea that they occupied, in regard to that subject, a position better than that of the New York Society, and more suited to promote the peace of the Church. These things being so, the pro-slavery minority promptly coalesced with the time-serving majority. "Like kindred drops, they mingled into one." And the mass of the New England Churches are so corrupt on this subject that great numbers of them will probably transfer their allegiance from the New York Society to this, as a measure of quiescence; a means of hearing no more about slavery.

7. The action of Rev. Edward N. Kirk in this meeting, and his language in the public or show-meeting of the Society subsequently held, are worthy of particular attention, because they represent the position and action of a very large class of clergymen in regard to slavery.

Dr. Kirk has for a dozen years past kept himself "on the fence," or near it, in respect to this subject. Ever and anon, through this whole period, he has made little tentative sallies, now on this side the fence, now on that, trying whether the time had come for emphatic utterance and prominent display of himself on either side. As each of these efforts, in turn, failed to elicit the popular response for which he was obviously waiting, he returned to his *post*, and patiently waited another opportunity. Whenever the Church shall in a solid body, and with entire unanimity, set her face and exalt her voice against slavery, then Dr. Kirk will be seen, in the fore-front of her array, loudly praising the Lord that the day is at last come for which *he* has so long been praying and laboring. We wish now to quote some of his expressions in the two Tract meetings which seem to show him yet doubtful about the next turn of the tide, and providing for conformity to the next Church-fashion that comes up, whether it be pro slavery or anti-slavery.

At the business meeting of the Boston Tract Society, after its vote of separation from the New York one, Mr. Copp of Chelsea, a favorer of the latter Society, presented a resolution strongly declaring respect for its position, belief in its excellence and usefulness, and confidence in the Christian character of its managers.

A few moments of solemn silence followed, looking like general acquiescence in the resolution (which was, after all, no more absurd, hypocritical and self-stultifying than the resolution which the same body had *unanimously* passed at the previous annual meeting, declaring their *respect* and *affection* for the Secretary whom they then turned out of office, and their thanks for his long and *faithful* services).

Dr. Kirk rose and spoke in favor of the resolution, in which, however, he pointed out the need of a slight verbal amendment to make it strictly grammatical.

The need of still further amendment was suggested by others, and the resolution was referred, for these slight changes of expression, to a special Committee, Messrs. Copp, Kirk and Bacon, who shortly after presented it in a form satisfactory to them, as follows:

"Resolved, That in dissolving with the American Tract Society at New York a connection which, for thirty-four years, has been signally beneficial to both Societies, and a source of extended usefulness to the cause of Christ in the world, we desire to proceed with tenderness and Christian courtesy, and to separate from our brethren in the exercise of charity and forbearance in respect to the difference of opinion which divides our counsels, and with no other feelings toward them than love and a sincere desire that the wisdom which is from above may guide all their future operations. And now, having receded from the connection which has existed for so many years of useful coöperation to our original status, we shall continue to entertain feelings of Christian regard towards the American Tract Society at New York, and hope so to conduct our operations as to avoid all just causes of strife between us; and, as far as possible, to conduct our operations in harmony and peace with theirs, as brethren and Christians, having, in the main, the same great objects in view."

Rev. Mr. Dexter of Boston, Rev. Mr. Wolcott of Providence, and others, then spoke decidedly against the resolution; Rev. Mr. Copp followed in its favor; then Dr. Kirk said:

"I would suggest to brother Wolcott, and those who sympathize with him, that we are not all united in regard to this matter. When we have taken our stand, and said, 'We will publish on slavery, and they shall not prevent us,' we have done our duty. When I have set up my barriers and got fairly entrenched, so that I cannot be forced from my position, all the kind words I can say I am ready to say. I hope brother Wolcott will withdraw his objection."

The objection, however, far from being withdrawn, was echoed by many other gentlemen, some of them of advanced age, and weighty influence. Rev. Dr. Leavitt of Providence said, with a deliberate emphasis which called forth hearty applauses from the audience, that the sentiment from New England was one of "*compassionate disapproval* of the position of the New York Society," and Dr. Hawes of Hartford characterized the language of the resolution (to which Dr. Kirk, be it remembered, had just put the finishing touches) as "fulsome language."

The chairman then put the question, and the resolution was indefinitely postponed, very few dissenting. *Then*—

"Rev. Mr. Kirk said that, after hearing what had been said, he was perfectly willing that the resolution should be indefinitely postponed. At first, when he thought of the venerable men who had made the connection, it seemed to him that something more than a formal vote dissolving the connection was desirable. That was the only reason he had for desiring the passage of the resolution."

Was a weathercock ever more courteous to a wind?

At the second or show-meeting of the Boston Society, which was held at the Tremont Temple in the evening, and very largely attended, Dr. Kirk was one of the pre-arranged speakers. He commenced his speech by reading to the audience a note which (he said) he had just received, requesting him to speak of the New York Society in terms of pointed severity and rebuke. He said he should not do that. His presence on that platform sufficiently indicated the side he took in the controversy. (!) But, if anything further was necessary, he would say with his friend Dr. Leavitt of Providence (repeating the expression, and imitating, with consummate skill, the very tone, which had called forth such loud applause in the business meeting)—"I feel a *compassionate disapproval* of the course of my brethren in New York."

Although this sentiment was again warmly applauded, Dr. Kirk could not omit his habitual practice of laying an anchor to windward, and providing against a change of weather. He spoke of their *policy* as a publishing Society, and, alluding to the numerous inquiries that had been made as to what *principle* would regulate their publication of tracts, he said, "At the end of this year, *after trial*, we may tell you about our *principles*."

Further on in his speech, he ventured upon the following statement, which probably seems to him a self-evident proposition, though it would allow the defence of every popular sin to be the legitimate work of the Tract Society existing in the midst of it.

"A RELIGIOUS TRACT SOCIETY SHOULD BE AN EXPONENT OF THE MORAL AND RELIGIOUS SENTIMENT OF THE CHURCH."

According to this doctrine, the South Carolina Tract Society might properly publish a tract in advocacy of the slave trade; and the Boston Tract Society might publish one recommending all Churches to adopt the Park street rule, of the exclusion of colored people from respectable seats on the floor of the church on Sundays.

Dr. Kirk, who is a member of the Executive Committee (which includes the function of Publishing Committee) of the Boston Society, then made this modest suggestion to any present who might wish to write tracts to offer to that body.

"Let those who write tracts *write humbly*; and be content that the Committee should say—This is not just what we want"!

Dr. Kirk closed his address with the following utterance, no doubt one of the most sincere that it contained.

"God is moving on to set the nations free. If this event does not come in our time, *we will wait.*"

It is certain that Dr. Kirk will be a *patient* waiter for any event towards the accomplishment of which he cannot walk "in silver slippers, in the sunshine, and with applause."

Yet Mr. Wolcott and Mr. Dexter (who have given some indications of being heartily desirous to act against slavery), as if suffering under judicial blindness in penalty for their attempted service of two masters, greet Dr. Kirk as a Christian brother, and seem to consider him an honest and valuable ally in their work against slavery!

* See STANDARD of last week—Pro-Slavery head.

YEARLY MEETING OF PROGRESSIVE FRIENDS.

ABOLITIONISTS, of whatever phase of religious opinion, will naturally feel a lively interest in the proceedings of a Religious Society whose origin may be directly traced to the agitation caused by the Anti-Slavery Movement, whose members are all warm friends of the slave, and which has ever borne a faithful and uncompromising testimony against slavery and its abettors, whether in Church or State.

Many of our readers remember the exposures made in these columns in 1840-41 of the pro-slavery character of New York Quakerism, as illustrated in the preaching of the late George F. White, and in the disownment, on account of their abolitionism, of the late venerable Isaac T. Hopper, and the no less revered Charles Marriott. The spirit of persecution, beginning here, spread through every part of the Hicksite body, and the resistance to that spirit led to an open division in two or three Yearly Meetings and to severe controversies in several others. These divisions led directly to the organization, in various places, of new religious associations, taking in some instances the name of Progressive Friends, in others the name of Friends of Human Progress, and composed partly of Quakers and partly of persons whose religious training had been in other religious denominations. There are now, under one or the other of the above names, not less than five Yearly Meetings, all standing substantially upon the same basis and seeking the same object. One of these is in Indiana, one in Ohio, two are in New York, and one in Pennsylvania. The last named, though not the first in the order of time, is largest of all, and is probably exerting the widest influence upon public opinion. Its nucleus is in Chester County, and it embraces among its members many persons of high moral and social standing. Its annual gatherings have for seven successive years drawn together a large number of earnest and intelligent men and women, whose object it has been to realize the benefits of religious association and fellowship without any creed, ritual, or ecclesiastical machinery; to substitute for the formalism of the popular sects a religion of practical goodness; to deal faithfully and fearlessly with the living issues which the popular Churches either ignore or meet only in the spirit of compromise; and to testify, with constant and unwavering fidelity, not only against slavery, but against every other moral evil. We suppose that, as a matter of fact, most of those who coöperate with this and kindred associations hold what the so-called evangelical Churches regard as heretical opinions upon some questions of theology, but the association imposes no theological test whatever, but is open on equal terms to persons of every shade of religious belief and speculation. Its bond of union is purely ethical and philanthropic. It does not even desire that its members shall be agreed in their theological views, but only that they may be of one spirit in works of charity and mercy, that they may all alike manifest their love of God by doing good to each other and to the world. Its platform is free for the discussion of every subject that concerns humanity, theology not excepted; but care is exercised to keep theological speculations subordinate to practical righteousness.

The Pennsylvania Yearly Meeting of Progressive Friends assembled at Longwood, Chester Co., on Sunday, the 29th ult. The weather being fine, not less than 5,000 people came together. The meeting-house would not hold one-fourth of the multitude, and religious exercises were held not only within its walls, but in several different places in the open air. The five roads diverging from the meeting-house were lined, on both sides, for a great distance, with vehicles, presenting a scene so picturesque that more than one stranger from a distance remarked it was well worth a long journey to see. Never did we see a more decorous crowd of people. They listened, whether in the house or in the open air, with deep interest to the radical and progressive views of the speakers, and, when the meeting was over, retired in good order to their respective homes. Not a drop of intoxicating liquors was seen; even the tavern-keeper in the neighborhood showed his respect for the meeting and its objects by closing his bar for the day.

The two sessions on Sunday were devoted almost exclusively to speaking, and some very interesting addresses were delivered. The speaker whose communications attracted the widest attention was Thomas Wentworth Higginson, of Worcester, Mass. He spoke in the house in the morning and to the multitude outside in the afternoon, explaining and defending, with impressive eloquence, the peculiar views of the Progressive Friends. Griffith M. Cooper, once a Commander of a U. S. vessel of war, and more recently a minister of the Society of Friends, was also one of the speakers; so also was Isaac Trescott, of Salem, Ohio, John H. W. Toohey, of Cleveland, John Beeson, the champion of the Indians, E. H. Coates, of Mullica Hill, N. J., Rowland Johnson, of Orange, N. J., Joseph A. Dugdale, of Chester County, and Oliver Johnson, of New York.

On Monday and the two following days the house was crowded. Joseph A. Dugdale, Elizabeth Jackson and Oliver Johnson were appointed Clerks. There was no President, the Clerks exercising, when necessary, the powers of a presiding officer.

The subjects which came prominently before the meeting, and upon which Testimonies were adopted, were the following: Slavery, Caste, War, Intemperance, Tobacco, Education, Spiritualism, Sectarianism, the Treatment of Criminals, the Wrongs of the Indians, Marriage. The debates upon some of these subjects were of deep interest. Of these Testimonies we publish the following, believing that our readers, not even excepting those who may not agree with all the sentiments they contain, will be glad to see them in our columns, illustrating, as they do, a religious movement which constitutes one of the peculiar features of the time.

SLAVERY.

A continual dropping will wear away the rock. The constant preaching of truth and righteousness must have its effect on error and sin.

We renew our protest against "the sum of all villanies," Slavery. By our love of God and Man, we are admonished to consider our own relation to this great national sin. Desiring to use our influence against it, wherever it exists, we are especially bound to make our own State free from all direct share in the wrong.

This cannot be so long as every foot of its soil remains, as now, a hunting-ground for fugitive slaves. The time has come when every one of the so-called free States should declare its soil truly free, and prohibit, by express statute, the kidnapping of men *on any pretence*. One State, Vermont, has already done this: in that State every man or woman, of whatever color or condition, is legally free and cannot be enslaved. In Massachusetts and New York a similar bill has been reported and very nearly passed. It is proper that at the next session of the Pennsylvania Legislature a vigorous effort should be made for the enactment of a similar law, and we call upon Progressive Friends to take efficient action for that end.

Where human liberty is concerned, we can make no compromises. The United States Constitution, as usually interpreted, protects and sustains slavery. Every party and every individual, acting politically under the Constitution, is morally a partaker in this guilt, or can only escape from it by insisting upon an anti-slavery interpretation of this instrument. But to concede, as most politicians do, the pro-slavery character of the Constitution and still pledge themselves, when required, to its support, is a gross inconsistency and an injury to freedom. The same just condemnation waits on every religious sect which joins hands with the oppressor, or fails to coöperate with all earnest men, upon a common platform of anti-slavery action.

We have no sympathy with those who idly suppose that the main battle with slavery has already been fought. On the contrary we foresee, in the future, conflicts greater, perhaps, than any in the past. The audacious and thus far successful efforts for the revival of the slave trade, will be sufficient (were there nothing else) to complicate the problem yet farther, and offer new issues between Right and Wrong. May we be faithful to our duty, in all times of trial.

CASTE.

Among the numerous evils resulting from slavery is the debasing and cruel influence of caste. Where one particle of African blood is found, it is made an excuse for insult and oppression. Before the anti-slavery agitation had rebuked this sin, there was no sanctuary for the colored man, no motive to emulation, no inducement for high and holy aspiration on his part—no one to say, "Friend, come up higher." In consequence of that agitation the prejudice of color is visibly abated, so that in some of the educational institutions of the country colored children are admitted upon equal terms with those of a white complexion. We have in this State at least one school (Mr. Sunderland's, at Perkiomen Bridge) where colored girls share equally with others the benefits of the institution. Notwithstanding these exceptions, however, our colored brethren are still subject to many indignities and privations on account of their complexion. They are denied many of the rights belonging to them as men. In most of the States they are either debarred from the right of suffrage or permitted to exercise it only upon arbitrary and unjust conditions. The cruel spirit of caste grinds them to the dust. We enter our earnest protest against this soul-debasing spirit, and will exert our influence as individuals and as a Religious Society to counteract and destroy it.

WAR.

We are constrained to renew our testimony against War as wrong in itself, and therefore unjustifiable in any circumstances. We believe it to be the duty of mankind to "love their enemies," to "render to no man evil for evil," to "overcome evil with good," and to rely upon the power of truth and love for the protection of life, liberty and property.

SECTARIANISM.

We renew our protest against Sectarianism, and against the superstitions which are the foundation of sectarianism. No man is sectarian merely from the love of bigotry, but from belief in some superstition which perverts his intellect and narrows his heart. We therefore claim it as the first and most essential mission of our movement to overthrow superstition by love, reason and true religion.

Among these superstitions we include all creeds and forms which regard God as a stern tyrant and man as a being totally depraved. We consider that the larger and more conservative sects are bound to a system of formalism which separates them from practical religion and takes the place which should be given to active philanthropy. We hold that the smaller and more progressive sects are checked and weakened by the want of fidelity to their own principles, and by bondage to the "letter" which "killeth." We protest against the idolatry which would substitute a book or a man for that Inner Light which lighteneth every man. Recognizing the value of the example of Jesus of Nazareth, and of portions of the teachings of the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures, we yet assert the highest authority to lie in the living inspirations which God gives to the willing soul to-day.

We also judge the existing sects by the maxim, "By their fruits ye shall know them," and in their indifference to the actual wrongs of society—to intemperance, to slavery and to the wrongs of woman—we see melancholy proofs that they have not the Divine authority they claim.

MARRIAGE.

We regard Marriage as an institution sacred and divine in its ends, but too often degraded by the sensuality and tyranny of man, and the dependent position of woman. We renounce the idea, hitherto asserted by Church and State, that man is born to command and woman to obey. We hold to the absolute equality of the sexes, as to rights and duties, and condemn all laws and usages which deny this. We claim for woman the right of free speech, of suffrage, and of just compensation for labor. Especially do we claim for her the supreme control of her own person, and utterly deny the right of any husband to force upon his wife the sacred duties of maternity, against her will.

Letters of sympathy and encouragement were received from several other bodies, and from a large number of individuals, among whom we may mention the Rev. A. D. Mayo of Albany, the Rev. Samuel Johnson of Salem, Mass., the Rev. M. D. Conway of Cincinnati, the Rev. J. G. Forman of Alton, the Rev. W. H. Fish of Toledo, and L. Maria Child. Mrs. Child's letter is so full of the very spirit of Christianity, which is the spirit of universal brotherhood, and contains so little to which any one can take exception, that we are sure every one of our readers will thank us for copying it.

TO THE ANNUAL MEETING OF PROGRESSIVE FRIENDS.

WAYLAND, May 2d, 1859.

The returning season of growth always brings to mind your Annual Meeting, where I trust good seed is sown to be multiplied in future harvests. No matter how few meet together, nor how little is the immediate and obvious gain of their meeting. If there is *life* there, it will germinate. Look at the small, thin seed of the mighty elm! Who could foresee the wondrous growth therein contained? The graceful spreading branches, wherein birds and insects innumerable find happy homes, the enormous roots, the solid bulk of wood, were all contained in that small, thin seed. Perchance a hen scratched a hole for its reception, the wind carried it to its destination, and a dog covered it. By these humble agents were sun and rain enabled to stir within it the latent principle of life. It is the same with the seed of *spiritual* growth. All, who are in earnest for the truth, are working for far greater results than they can calculate. Nay, many who are working merely for themselves, like the hen and the dog, are unwittingly planting some wind-scattered grain of truth, that is blown into their path.

The greatest obstacle in the way of social progress is the want of moral courage. Godwin says truly: "If every man would tell to-day all the truth he knows, three years hence there would scarcely be a falsehood of any magnitude in the civilized world." Few dare openly to question time-honored creeds and institutions, even when they clearly see their fallacy, or have had experimental proof of their utter want of adaption to the requirements of the soul. And of the few who venture to express dissent, only a small fraction do it with the strength of serious conviction, or with the gentleness induced by large, comprehensive views and expansive sympathies. Those who attack old systems are too apt to do it with flippant jeers, or arrogant aggressiveness. Why should I hasten to call a man a fool because I anticipate that he will call me a sceptic? Perhaps if I knew more of his interior state, I should perceive that he was no fool; and if he could clearly see mine, he would be aware that I was no sceptic. In all probability, the only real difference between us would prove to be the inevitable result of different stages in our spiritual growth. Fortunately, the All-Wise Father has so constituted our souls as to enable us to receive truths in such degrees and modifications as are best adapted to our needs; even as plants absorb more or less of certain rays of light, and thus become diverse in color. Light remains eternally the same; its various hues are produced by the receptive capacity of the objects whereon it shines. We do not mock at the ruby for reflecting only the red ray, or at the topaz for reflecting only the yellow. Why, then, should we require of human beings uniformity in their reception of truth, which is *spiritual* light?

Above all other lessons, we need to learn that men *cannot* all see truths in the same way. It is positively out of their power, by reason of their different physical and mental organizations, of the varying influences of education, of personal experience, and of social surroundings. Pines that grow on the southern slope of the Alps make better violins than those that grow on the northern side. Who is acute enough to explain by what process the sunshine makes the southern pines more musical? And how much *more* difficult would it be to define all the subtle *spiritual* influences, which, in fashioning the growth of our *souls*, make them more or less responsive to the eternal harmonies!

Even the same individual changes so entirely in the course of his life that the angels, if they designate us according to our interior condition, cannot continue to call him by the same name. How many are there among you who, at forty years old, retain the same views of God, or your own souls, or the state of society, that you entertained when you were twenty? The years pass over, and leave with you a thousand imperceptible influences, that effect your *spiritual* growth as inevitably as they do the *natural* growth of the oak or the elm. If some friend, who sympathizes with you fully at forty, should seek for you at the same spiritual stand-point, after a separation of twenty years, the probability is that he would not find you where he left you; and when you compared notes together, you would mutually be puzzled to understand by what process those who were once so near had wandered so wide apart.

God *intended* variety in spiritual as well as in natural growth. The oak, by virtue of its organization, cannot be other than an oak; a willow cannot be other than a willow; a palm other than a palm. Moreover, an old oak cannot remain the same as a young oak; and a willow far from water must develop its life imperfectly, as also must human souls when removed from the spiritual influences suited to their organizations.

As I grow older, I am less and less inclined to accept anything upon authority, or to slight anything which, in the light of my own soul, seems to be good or true. I am equally desirous to grow freely myself, and not to impede the free growth of others. I cannot despise any utterance which I believe to be sincere, however widely it may differ from my own, and however earnest I may be to convince men of its fallacy. Jean Paul Richter says: "Teach your child as lovingly to accept different forms of religion among men as their different languages, wherein there is still but one human mind expressed. Every genius has most power in his own tongue, and every heart in its own religion."

The tendency to Eclecticism, which I noticed in a previous letter, becomes more and more observable. Christianity gradually modifies other religions, though not apparently destined to supersede them entirely. But, manifestly superior as it is to other religions of the earth, there is much that it might copy from them advantageously. The Buddhist Commandments, "Thou shalt not speak of injuries," and "Thou shalt not excite quarrels by repeating the words of others," are worthy of being added to our Decalogue. The Hindoo reverence for *all* places of worship is worthy of our imitation. The Mohammedan law, that legitimate and illegitimate children, shall share equally in the division of their fathers' estates, shames the narrow and cruel prejudice which prevents a just distribution of property among us. If we were to adopt also the law of the Mohammedans, never to hold in slavery one of their own faith, it would save us from the disgrace of offering Ministers of the Gospel for sale in the market, and demanding a higher price for them because they can be warranted to have too much religion to murder their masters.

slaveholders of the South that the antagonism of the North to slavery is a reality.

I have but little to communicate in the way of news, for few events occur, out of the ordinary routine, to disturb the monotony of our every-day life in this little island. Since I returned from the States, an intelligent colored gentleman, a Mr. Prescod, has been elected to represent the City of Bridgetown in the Colonial Parliament. I have to-day had an application for half an acre of land. He obtains it at a reduced price for $200. It is not a building lot, but an ordinary piece of ground, far away from town, to be employed solely for agricultural purposes. This little incident shows how profitable the investment of capital in West India property has become since emancipation. Two or three weeks ago an eccentric wealthy old man died in this neighborhood. He was one of the old line planters, and has left two estates, one of which has been out of cultivation for seven years; and to morrow they are to be put up for public sale, the reserve price being £30,000, equal to about $150,000. They will probably sell considerably in advance of this. The old man was never married, but he leaves nineteen colored children, the offspring of two black women, amongst whom the bulk of his ample property is to be divided—the two estates I have mentioned being only a part of his wealth.

On the 19th of March, the corner-stone of my "New-England School" was laid, and arrangements are in progress for commencing the sister institution, "the Canada School"; both to be erected partly by funds supplied by the liberality of friends on your side of the Atlantic. I have been enabled to enlarge my scheme of school extension since my return from America; and when it is completed, I shall have fourteen hundred colored children receiving good intellectual and moral training, which would not otherwise be within their reach.

Our respected Governor, Mr. Hincks, left for Canada and the States a short time ago. His personal testimony on the comparative value of slave and free labor, if you can fall in with him, would be valuable to the Anti-Slavery cause.

I have written a few lines to friend Garrison, whom I greatly esteem and honor for his self-denying and uncompromising fidelity to the Anti-Slavery cause. When the day comes for erecting a statue to the honor of the man who is first amongst the heroes of the great Anti-Slavery struggle, it will not be to Clarkson, or Wilberforce, or Buxton, but to Wm. Lloyd Garrison, who has far surpassed them all in doing and suffering for the down-trodden slave. The blessing of multitudes who were ready to perish will come upon his head.

I have, in my note to Mr. Garrison, mentioned that the quarterly assizes for this Island have recently terminated, and the calendar exhibited only 26 cases for trial, none of them of a very serious character. The population is nearly 140,000, and seven-eighths of the whole black or colored. I very much doubt whether you will find in any English or American county, with an equal population, so small a proportion of crime. Such facts as these may serve to disabuse the minds of those who have been gulled by pro-slavery misrepresentation into the belief that barbarism and crime are rapidly overspreading the emancipated colonies of Britain.

Praying that your labors in behalf of the slave may be triumphant against all opposition,

I am, my dear sir, very truly yours, HENRY BLEBY.

The boxes forwarded by Mr. Bleby came safely to hand. He will please accept our thanks.

Our European Correspondence.

LETTERS FROM PARIS.....NO. IV.

PARIS, May 12.

LAST week I announced to you the death of one of our most distinguished statesmen, and now I regret to give you the news of a loss which will be felt by all nations, but nowhere, I feel assured, more than in the United States. The venerable Humboldt died last week, at the age of ninety, in Berlin. His whole life is so familiar to all that I need not repeat what is universally known. I will only say here that the Abolitionists, above all others, should remember with deep respect the man who, at all times, has given the most uncompromising testimony against the institution of slavery. His sympathy with the oppressed races in America was deep and sincere, and it is impossible to read his books without feeling that his heart was as generous as his genius was comprehensive. He was one of the few men whom a life of courts and the constant spectacle of flattery and servility could not corrupt; and though a chamberlain of the King of Prussia, he never ceased to defend and profess liberalism. Only a few weeks before his death, though aged and infirm, he went to vote at the general elections of Prussia, and gave his ticket for the liberal candidates.

It was given to Humboldt to predict, in his earliest work, the fate impending on Spanish America. At the time he visited it, he foretold that in case those colonies should throw off the yoke of the metropolis, they would be incapable of forming a confederation similar to the American Union. He saw that the work of the Catholic clergy and the habits of the Spanish colonists had prepared the gradual decomposition of these rich countries, which your government will now grasp, one after the other. But, though his intelligent mind saw clearly the defects of the people who inhabit the States of Central America, Humboldt always entertained a great feeling of sympathy for them and their struggles for independence. He was the friend of the men who accomplished the revolutions in these States, and he never spared them his good counsels. By his feelings Humboldt evidently belonged to that race of men now almost extinct amongst us—the men whom the philosophical revolution of the last century, the American war of independence and the principles of the French revolution had deeply impressed with a love of humanity, a strong feeling of the equality of all men, and filled with generous and noble aspirations for the welfare of nations and the peace of the world. Alas, these principles seem at times almost forgotten; violence and fraud rule the nations; the slaveholder in America and the despot in Europe both trample upon the divine rights of men; and such is the darkness of the present time that one hardly knows where to look for hope and justice. The war in Europe is now begun, and French and Austrian armies will once more contend in the plains of Italy. The other powers of Europe are waiting impatiently for the moment when they can, with some hope of success, enter the contest. Louis Napoleon left Paris yesterday for the seat of war, cheered on his passage up the Rue de Rivoli to the Embarcadère de Lyons. For the first time for years—I may say since the *coup d'état*—he was met with real and unbought enthusiasm; and this from a people who, three months ago, were greatly indisposed to the war. What shall the *wise* think, in the midst of this confusion? Show me the high rocks spoken of by the great Latin poet, Lucretius, from which one sees the tempest, the sea and the vessels wrecked on the coast!

I believe I have already spoken to you of the new work of Edmond About, entitled "*La Question Romaine.*" It is only since the Emperor's departure that it can be obtained here. The book was printed in Paris, but, as it is a bitter attack upon the Papal government, it was thought best to send the sheets to Brussels and have it published there. I have just read the work, and will send it to you by the earliest opportunity. It is evidently in the interest of the Bonapartes. The conclusion of About is that if the Catholics wish their spiritual sovereign to be independent (as his temporal rule is abominable), he must at least have as small a kingdom as possible; and he proposes, therefore, to separate from the papal States all the country lying on the other side of the Appenines, Ferrara, Bologna, Ancona, etc. This beautiful land then would undoubtedly be given to the Emperor's cousin, Napoleon Bonaparte, the son-in-law of Sardinia. But there is no mention of this in the book, though it is much rumored here. The book contains an amusing description of priestly government and its effects, written without gravity—I might almost say without dignity—and with much of that daring and sarcastic spirit which was so current in the last century. To enable you to judge of the merits and defects of M. About's manner, I subjoin a few extracts, selecting the description of Cardinal Antonelli and of the actual rule in Rome.

"The Cardinal was born in a den of thieves. Sonnino, his native village, was more celebrated in the history of crime than all Arcadia in the annals of virtue. This nest of vultures is hidden in the southern mountains, near the boundary of the kingdom of Naples. Roads impracticable to the gendarmerie surround it, Thick forests, deep ravines and secluded grottoes form a landscape which seems expressly made for the convenience of crime. The houses, old, ill built, and scarcely habitable, were principally used as depôts of pillage and magazines of plunder. The strong and vigorous population have cultivated, for several hundred years, all the arts of crime, and gained their livelihood by gun-shot; the new-born infants have breathed in contempt of the laws with the air of the mountains, and, as soon as they could walk, have been endued into moccasins of undressed leather (*le ciocce*), in order to run lightly on the steepest mountains. When they have acquired the art of pursuit and escape, of taking without being themselves taken, learned the value of various coinage, the arithmetic of the division of goods, and the principles of the rights of man as they are practised in that locality, their education is complete.

"The youth and infancy of Giacomo Antonelli were subjected to two contradictory influences. If the brigands had given him his first lessons, the gend'armes gave him others afterwards. He was early in a position to reflect on the difficulties and dangers of brigandage before having partaken of its pleasures. Around him a few men of progress were seeking occupations less perilous than theft. The young man hesitated long in the choice of a profession. His natural and inherited vocation was that of all the inhabitants of Sonnino—to live in abundance, to deny themselves no sort of pleasure, to be at home in all places, to depend on no one, to domineer over the people, to intimidate them if need be, and, above all, to violate all law with impunity. To attain so high an end, and not to expose a life which was always dear to him, he entered the great seminary of Rome. In our sceptical country, when a young man enters the seminary, it is with the hope of being ordained a priest. Antonelli had no such idea. In the capital of the Catholic Church, even the least intelligent Levites become magistrates, prefects, counsellors of state and ministers of state. The priests are made of the stupid and ignorant ones. Antonelli became so distinguished that he escaped, with God's help, from the sacrament of the order. He has never said mass or confessed any one. I will not even affirm that he has himself been to confession. He obtained the friendship of Gregory XVI. and became successively prelate, magistrate, prefect, minister of the interior and of finance. Who shall say he did not choose the right road? A minister of finance, who knows his trade ever so little, economizes more money in six months than all the brigands of Sonnino in twenty years. Under Gregory XVI. he made himself *réactionaire*, to be agreeable to his sovereign. On the succession of Pio Nono, he professed, for the same reason, liberal ideas. A red hat and a portfolio were the recompense of his new convictions, and proved to the inhabitants of Sonnino that even liberalism was more lucrative than brigandage. What a lesson for these mountaineers! one of their brothers in arms driving in his carriage even before the barracks, and the soldiers presenting arms instead of firing upon him! He gained the confidence of the new Pope as he had done that of the old one, and it was soon seen that the best way to seize people was not to arrest them on the high road. Pio Nono, who had no secrets from him, confided to him his desire to moderate the abuses, but without hiding his fear of not succeeding. Antonelli served the holy father even in his irresolutions. He retired from the ministry when he saw some risk to run, but aided the Pope in the secret opposition he made to his ministers. The murder of Rossi inspired him with serious reflections. When a man has taken the trouble to be born at Sonnino, it is not for the purpose of letting himself be assassinated: quite the contrary. He placed in safety both the Pope and himself, and came to play at Gaeta the part of secretary of state *in partibus*. From this exile dates his unlimited power over the mind of the Pope, his rehabilitation in the eyes of the Austrians, and all the more recent unity of his conduct. No more contradictions in his political life. Those who accused him of hesitating between the good of the nation and his personal interest are reduced to silence. He works for the restoration of the absolute power of the Popes in order to dispose of it at his ease. He prevents all true and good understanding between Pio Nono and his subjects. He summons the canons of Catholicity to the conquest of Rome, and insults the French who let themselves be killed for him. He shuts his ears to the *liberal* counsels of Napoleon III. [I quote About, remember], and prolongs designedly the exile of his master. At last he returns, and for ten years he has reigned over a timid old man and a people in chains, opposing a passive resistance to all the counsels of diplomacy and all the wishes of Europe, holding on with a death-grasp to power, careless of the future, abusing the present and every day augmenting his fortune after the fashion of Sonnino."

* * * * * * * * *

"His family is prosperous; his four brothers, Phillip, Louis, Gregory and Angelo (excuse the contradiction) wore the *cioccie* in their youth: they all wear to-day a count's coronet. One is governor of the bank—an excellent affair; another curator of Rome under a senator chosen for his nullity; another publicly exercises the trade of a speculator, with great facilities for interdicting or authorizing exportation, according as his magazines are full or empty. The youngest is the travelling agent or messenger, the diplomatist of the family, *Angelus domini*. The Count Dandino, who is but a cousin, rules the police. This little world turns, returns, and augments an invisible fortune, according to its kind. They are not pitied at Sonnino. But this strong, lucky mortal, Antonelli, has one weakness—a natural one: he fears death. A certain great and beautiful person, whom the *Eminentissime* has honored with his tenderness, told me [remember, it is *About* who speaks-], in precise terms:

"'When I arrived at the rendezvous, he threw himself upon me like a madman, and felt my pockets; and only when he had fully assured himself that I had no bidden arms about me did he remember that we were friends.'

"Since a poor idiot appeared before him with a *fork* in his hand, he never goes out without the greatest precaution. His horses gallop furiously through the streets, and each must lock out for himself. Fear of death, a passion for money, family attachment, contempt of mankind, indifference to the happiness of the people, and divers other traits of accidental resemblance, have caused Antonelli to be compared to Mazarin. Born in the same mountains or nearly so, one introduced himself furtively into the heart of a woman, the other into the mind of an old man. Both governed without scruple, and merited the hatred of their cotemporaries; and both spoke the most comical French in the world, having at the same time a perfect knowledge of all the *finesses* of the language. Nevertheless, it would be unjust to place them both on the same line. The selfish Mazarin dictated to Europe the treaties of Westphalia and the peace of the Pyrenees, and founded, by skilful diplomacy, the grandeur of Louis XIV., making the fortune of the French monarchy, not without taking good care of his own; Antonelli has made his fortune to the detriment of the nation, the Pope and the Church. Mazarin may be compared to a good tailor, but a rogue, who dresses his customers well, while saving a few ells for himself. Antonelli is like the Jews of the middle ages, who demolished the Coliseum to get the clamping-irons."

With more art and style, I think this would be called a clever book. As it is, I can only assure you that, as far as the facts are concerned, it is perfectly correct.

PREJUDICE AGAINST COLOR WEARING AWAY.—We are happy to notice, in many quarters, that the unchristian prejudice against color—which has too long operated as a principle of caste in many professed Christian Churches—is gradually yet perceptibly wearing away. As a recent and gratifying instance, we may mention that at the general anniversary of the Sunday Schools of Williamsburgh, L. I., in which an immense assemblage of children were gathered into one of the largest churches of the city, the place of honor—the most conspicuous position, in the central aisle—was assigned to a school composed almost entirely of colored children. This was the Bethesda Free Mission School, under the care of Mr. Samuel Harris, clerk of the City Court of Brooklyn, whose successful efforts in behalf of the escape of a fugitive slave, who was for a time caught and held in this city, are not yet forgotten by the friends of freedom.

THE WILBERFORCE CENTENARY.—Wednesday, August 24th, 1859, will be THE ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF WILBERFORCE, the Parliamentary champion of Negro Emancipation in Great Britain. His eminent services in the cause with which his name is forever identified would seem not only to justify but to demand an observance of the day on the part of those who are struggling to consummate the great work which he and his associates begun and carried forward with such remarkable success for so many years. Why not, for once, celebrate *on that day* the great event of West India Emancipation? We commend this suggestion to the earnest consideration of American Abolitionists, in the hope that, in some appropriate way, they will observe the Centenary of Wilberforce.

LITTELL'S LIVING AGE, No. 783, contains a beautiful likeness of Sir John Herschel, with a sketch of his life and character; also Part III. of "Chrisna, the Queen of the Danube," some minor articles and several good poems. 508 Broadway.

From our Boston Correspondent.

NO. CCXLIX.

THE ARGUMENT—The Correspondent commendeth the Editor—He confirmeth his account of the New England Convention—He doth justies to the zeal and piety of Boston in former days—And to that of New York now—He exulteth over kidnapping arrestations—But shuddereth at dialectic demandings—He illu-trateth by the Pearson case—He treateth of the Morphymania—He discriminateth and disserteth—He praiseth Mr. Morphy—And congratulateth all concerned that he was praiseworthy—how he came to see Mr. Morphy—Where he went first—He describeth Dr. Windship and the circumstances of his lecture—He is physiological and showeth how much he knows—He giveth his good wishes to the young Hercules, and endeth, &c. &c. &c.

BOSTON, May 6th, 1859.

THAT was a very correct *résumé* you gave, leaderwise, last week of the successful begining, progress and issue of the New England Anti-Slavery Convention. I did not see you there, but presume you must have been, as the account was clearly that of an eyewitness. The success of the occasion was all that you described it. The session held in the Music Hall was truly a magnificent one. It was a sight to see such masses of intelligent listeners crowding and clustering in that beautiful room. And they all came to hear, none, apparently, to scoff, as was sometimes the case at our great Faneuil Hall meetings. It was an Anti-Slavery audience, emphatically, for, though all present might not be Abolitionists, they all came to hear Anti-Slavery talk; and if that doesn't make an Anti-Slavery audience, the mischief is in it. In Faneuil Hall, in former years, a great proportion of those present came as it were to a bull fight, to see the Abolitionists worried by the puppies that the Piety and Politics of Boston had raised and trained for that amusement. Now we seem to have established our position as a recognized respectability among the May Meetings, to be as well entreated as the American Board, or the Tract Society itself. I suppose some excellent friends of ours will think this a very bad sign, showing that we are no longer worthy to be stoned. But I rather think it is the natural and healthy course of things in such a movement as ours. It is not that we have changed ourselves, but that we have changed, at least to the extent of external decency, those among whom we live. Our mantle of martyrdom seems to have fallen upon the Woman's Rights cause, judging from the missionary efforts of the pious youth of New York, who came in last month, hissing-hot from the fervors of the business-men's Prayer-meetings and the sweet communion of the Young Men's Christian Association, to stop Lucretia Mott and her dangerous confederates. However, Wendell Phillips gave them their gruel, and it is to be hoped it agreed with them.

The second day of the Convention was agreeably diversified by the announcement of the fact that the Cape Cod kidnappers, whose villany you have recorded, had been arrested and bound over for trial. The scoundrel who carried the poor wretch back to slavery, for five hundred dollars, has since been arrested at Gloucester, and also held to answer. His name is Bacon, and he certainly resembles his great synonymon in being "the meanest of mankind," though not, probably, as "the brightest and wisest." It is to be hoped that these wretches may meet with their deserts and expiate by a few years of unpaid labor at Charlestown for the life of slavery to which they have condemned a man worth them all a hundred times over. And yet, if they deserve the State's Prison for what they did, what should be done to Commissioner Curtis and Marshal Devens and to Judge Loring and Marshal Freeman, to say nothing of Mayors Bigelow and Smith, and not to mention General Elmands and Colonel Amory? I shudder at the logical necessities of my proposition. Still it would be some satisfaction to find that the little rogues cannot escape, though the big ones can. But it is by no means sure that it can be done, though a clearer case of a statute crime was never laid before a Grand Jury. But as that Inquest will be made up of Cape Cod skippers to a great extent, it remains to be seen whether there is virtue enough in them to find an indictment at the risk of damaging their coast-wise traffic with the South. And, if they should, whether a petty jury can be found to convict the rascals and a Judge to sentence them as they deserve. When John W. Pearson kidnapped a man and sent him back to slavery, some ten years ago, the Grand Jury of this County threw out the indictment, though the Judge charged them correctly as to the law, and the District Attorney, Mr. Samuel D. Parker, told them that the facts made out a perfect case. But the Grand Jury was made up of Boston merchants and men under their thumb, presided over by a Foreman who had himself once been tried for a State's Prison offence, escaping only by a technicality, and so they indorsed "*ignoramus*" on the bill. But ten years have worked great changes, and perhaps one of these will be found to be the possibility of convicting and punishing a kidnapper, by Massachusetts law. If so, it will be one of the most pregnant signs of the time.

Boston folks have had another good opportunity, of which they have availed themselves, of vindicating their proverbial reputation of being "full of notions," in their apotheosis of Mr. Paul Morphy, the little champion of Chess, since I wrote to you last. You will have seen how he was run after, how the Chess rooms were crowded with beauty and fashion to see him play what was just as unintelligible to the said beauty and fashion as if he had been chalking algebraic equations on a blackboard. At least, it was to me the time I looked in, as part of the beauty or the fashion, or both, to see how the famous young gentleman looked. And I must say he looked like a very modest and gentlemanlike young man, whose head did not seem to have been turned by all his triumphs on the checkered field of unchequered success. It was entirely well and appropriate that the Boston Chess Club should invite him to visit them, and entertain him at their expense, and give him a dinner as a mark of their admiration. But there does not appear to be any very adequate reason why Presidents of Harvard College, Professors, theological and otherwise, of the same, the Chief Justice of Massachusetts, the Governor and Senator Wilson, and other dignitaries, should be bidden to set at meat with him and should join enthusiastically in the ovation. Had he returned triumphant from the battles of European liberty, with Bonaparte and Bomba and Francis Joseph at his chariot-wheels, more could hardly have been done and said in his glory. It was lucky for all concerned that Mr. Morphy was so thoroughly well-bred and well-judging in his way of receiving his incense. His speech was a model one, and saved the occasion from much ridicule which might have easily been attached to it. Suppose, instead of being the quiet, unassuming youth he was, he had been a young Elijah Pogram—"a child of Freedom and a child of Natur, whose answer to the tyrant and the despot was, *my home is in the settin' sun!*" Suppose he had *spread-eagled* himself and saved the Union, and preached the gospel of negro-catching! "I shudder at the gross idea!" as the Princess Huncamunca in Tom Thumb does at that of *a Man*. Senator Wilson, I think, was the only one that saw anything *Unionalvatory* in the occasion. It may be, however, that all this is mere envy and malice on my part, inasmuch as *I* was not bidden to the feast. I don't know why I should not have been, for none that were could possibly have known less about chess than I do.

It was owing to rather an odd circumstance that I happened to see our young American Philidor at all, which I should have been sorry to miss, as one likes to see any man that does anything better than anybody else in the world. I received from a friend a ticket of admission to the Rooms of the Chess Club for a particular evening, but it happened to be one when I wished to go somewhere else. And that was to hear a lecture on Physical Development, by Dr. George B. Windship, a young physician of Roxbury. This young gentleman has made a specialty of muscular development as a part of Hygieaic Science, making himself the subject of his experiments. The result has been a degree of muscular power, or physical strength, seldom if ever exceeded. He can lift his own weight with his little finger, and handle a barrel of flour as a common man can a bucket of water, and lift, with his hands only, a dead weight of 926 pounds, equal to more than that of six men of average avoirdupois. This, I am told, is above a hundred weight more than M. Bichin, the Belgian giant, could lift, and Dr. Windship is no giant, but a man of medium size, weighing only about 143 pounds. As I have great faith in the virtue of gymnastic exercises as compensating for the sedentary mischiefs of civilized life, I was determined not to miss hearing his lecture and seeing his displays of strength. The place was the Mercantile Hall in Summer street, where most of the sessions of the New England Convention were held. The room was full, the night was hot and close, and the air as bad as could be with all the windows open, and that was bad enough. Dr. Windship appeared and opened his lecture on the vices of ventilation and the insensate folly of men in refusing to learn and obey the laws of their physical being as to the element in which they live. Before finishing this topic, he paused, presently staggered, and would have fallen had he not been caught by the bystanders and carried out insensible. After an anxious interval, he returned and attempted to go on, declaring that it was the first time he had ever fainted in his life. But in a few minutes he had to crave the indulgence of the audience a second time, and soon afterwards it was announced that he would not be able to proceed that night and must postpone his lecture to another time.

This seemed to many present, and to more that read the account of it, as a singular result of a highly cultivated physical condition; and yet it was, unquestionably, because of the high state of his health and the normal conditions under which he habitually lived that the young Hercules succumbed under the new conditions in which he found himself. I was informed by persons conversant with his way of life that Dr. Windship lives almost entirely in the open air, sleeping with his windows open, spending much of the day *sub dio Jove*, or in rooms scrupulously well ventilated. Coming that night into the lecture-room, reeking as it was with human exhalations raised almost to the boiling point, his lungs refused to play, and the strong man sunk down under the influence of the poison in the air. The only reason all the rest of us there did not fall down too was the fact that we had depraved and debauched our systems by habitually, or frequently, breathing impure air, and so accustomed ourselves to suck in the foul miasma without immediate sensible mischief, just as men gradually accustom themselves to use quantities of tobacco, rum, opium, arsenic even, which would kill a person of pure habits in a brief space of time. His own example was the very best illustration of his doctrine that he could have had. I trust he will soon try his hand again, in some place where he can have air enough to breathe, and expound the Philosophy and the Method of Physical Development—a subject surely of the highest moment to us as long as we live here on the earth (which I hope will be a great while!)—so as to teach men how to serve God with their bodies as well as with their souls. But it was owing to this interruption of my original plan for that evening that I came to see Mr. Morphy, which was how you came to hear about Dr. Windship. D. Y.

TWENTY-FOURTH

PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY FAIR,

AND

NATIONAL BAZAAR.

THE Committee of Management of this well-known Fair, in making their annual announcement, have, this year, to advertise a new arrangement which they have made for the promotion of that great cause in aid of which their Bazaar has been annually held for nearly a quarter of a century. It is that our next Bazaar is to be National in its character, and not, as heretofore, a Pennsylvania institution alone.

The National Anti-Slavery Bazaar, which has been held, in the city of Boston, during many years, and has been so widely and favorably known on both sides of the Atlantic, having given place to another method of obtaining funds for our cause, it has been judged a wise measure that the Pennsylvania Fair should be now made National in its character. As our whole enterprise, in all its departments, is truly one, and best known, both at home and abroad, by the name of the American Anti-Slavery Society and its affiliations, it is sufficient to announce that one-half of the profits of our Fair will be put into the treasury of the American Anti-Slavery Society, and the other half, under the direction of its auxiliaries, will be used for the promotion of our cause, in Pennsylvania.

It can scarcely be necessary even to advert to the character of the means by which our enterprise is conducted, so well are they known, both at home and abroad. It is sufficient to say that in the weapons with which we commenced this conflict, and which have, in all ages, proved "mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds" of evil, we confidently trust for complete victory. Still less is it needful that, in such an announcement as this, we should enter on an exposition of our well-known principles. We call upon all who love and value those principles to aid us in their dissemination.

To the friends of our cause in Europe, whose generous gifts have for many years been made to the Boston Bazaar, we say, let your contributions of money be devoted to our cause, through the medium of the Boston Anti-Slavery Festival, which has taken the place of that Bazaar; and permit us, if you please, to be the recipients of your other gifts which have been annually sent in various forms of articles of merchandise, to our coadjutors in Massachusetts. These products of your industry and taste and skill, these contributions from the shops and warehouses of your artisans and manufacturers, we can transmute to money, which money we shall receive as a sacred trust from you, to be appropriated, with our utmost fidelity and wisdom, to the abolition of American slavery.

To our friends and coadjutors at home, whose willing hearts and active hands have ever been quick to aid us in this department of our labor, we need to make but one suggestion. We merely remind them that as our Fair is, this year, to have a broader basis, and to extend its operations, it will require of us all somewhat larger gifts than heretofore, of labor, time, or money, according to our ability.

Our Bazaar will be opened in CONCERT HALL, in the City of Philadelphia, on Monday, the 12th, and will continue until Saturday, the 17th day of December, 1859. Contributions of money or of articles of merchandise will be gratefully received, and may be sent, at any time, to the Philadelphia Anti-Slavery Office, No. 107 North Fifth street, or to any member of the Committee. We trust that our friends, in the city and country, will be prompt in assuring us of their hearty and active coöperation.

The present aspects of our cause are full of encouragement; abounding proofs that our past labors have not been in vain bid us be of good cheer, while the magnitude of the work before us urges us onward to new toils and greater victories.

SARAH PUGH,	EMILY W. TAYLOR,
ANNA M. CHILD,	EVELINA SUPPLEE,
MARIA M. DAVIS,	EMMA PARKER,
REBECCA S. HART,	MARTHA KIMBER,
MARY GREW,	CLEMENTINE G. JOHN,
SARAH PIERCE,	SARAH KENDERDINE,
HULDAH JUSTICE,	ANNA M HOPPER,
ABBY KIMBER,	ELIZABETH GAY,
RACHEL WILSON,	LYDIA GILLINGHAM,
LUCRETIA MOTT,	JANETTE JACKSON,
SARAH C. HALLOWELL,	MARGARETTA FORTEN,
MARTHA A. GALVIN,	MARGARET A. GRISCOM,
ANNIE SMOEMAKER,	GULIELMA M. JONES,
ELLEN M. CHILD,	SARAH A. GILLINGHAM,
SARAH A. MCKIM,	AGNES CRAIN,
REBECCA PLUMLY,	HARRIET D. PURVIS,
LYDIA WHITE,	MARY T. STICKNEY,
MARGARET J. BURLEIGH,	SUSAN W. SHAW,
ROSANNA THOMPSON,	ELIZABETH CLENDENNON,
HANNAH L. STICKNEY,	MARIA CONKLIN,
MARY SHAW,	SARAH S. CHILD.

TRACTS FOR THE TIMES.

WE ask the particular attention of the friends of the Anti-Slavery cause to the following new series of tracts, just issued by the AMERICAN and MASSACHUSETTS ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETIES. They afford an excellent opportunity and means of aiding the cause, and of disseminating its great truths and principles. A little money expended in them may be made to accomplish a great good. These tracts may all be had at the following low prices: by the *hundred*, $2; *dozen*, 30 cts.; *single*, 3 cts. Apply at the Anti-Slavery Offices, 21 Cornhill, Boston, and 138 Nassau street, New York.

GREAT AUCTION SALE OF SLAVES AT SAVANNAH, GEORGIA. Reported for *The Tribune*.

PRESENT CONDITION OF THE FREE COLORED PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES. By Rev. James Freeman Clarke.

SPEECH OF WENDELL PHILLIPS, before the Committee on Federal Relations, of the Massachusetts Legislature, in behalf of the Petition for a Law against Slave-hunting.

NO FETTERS IN THE BAY STATE. Speech of Wm. Lloyd Garrison, on the same occasion.

SPEECH OF CHARLES C. BURLEIGH at the Annual Meeting of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society—"No Slave-hunting in the Old Bay State."

SPEECH OF REV. HENRY BLEBY, Missionary to Barbadoes, on the Results of Emancipation in the British West India Colonies.

SLAVERY AND THE AMERICAN BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS FOR FOREIGN MISSIONS. By C. K. W.

THE AMERCIAN TRACT SOCIETY, BOSTON. By C. K. W.

THE *Spiritual Telegraph*, one of the best journals of its class, contains every week reports of sermons preached by Henry Ward Beecher and E. H. Chapin on the Sunday next preceding its issue. This practice cannot fail to commend the paper to many besides those who feel an interest in Spiritualism. The reports are admirably made.

A LETTER FROM MRS. MARTINEAU, which our readers will expect to find in this issue, is received at the very instant of going to press. It must be deferred.

OBITUARY.

REMOVED to a higher life, on the 23d ult., at her residence in North Easton, Washington Co., N. Y., ESTHER WILBUR, wife of Job Wilbur, aged —, after a protracted physical weakness, which she passed through with great composure and firm reliance upon the "good hand of Him that doeth all things well."

As water seeks its level, so has her purified spirit sought its level in the glorious realities of spiritual life. Her funeral was attended by a large concourse of sympathizing friends and neighbors. Abundant testimony to her true and earnest life and labors was offered upon the occasion. The ancient language was repeated, as being especially applicable to her character in every particular: "When the ear heard me, then it blessed me; and when the eye saw me, it gave witness to me; because I delivered the poor that cried, and the fatherless, and him that had none to help him. The blessing of him that was ready to perish came upon me; and I caused the widow's heart to sing for joy. I put on righteousness, and it clothed me; my judgment was a robe and a diadem, I was eyes to the blind, and feet was I to the lame; and the cause I knew not I searched out."

"The friend of the slave, and yet the friend of all," the widow, the fatherless, the destitute and the trembling fugitive always found a cordial welcome at her hearth-stone, and a heart that beat warmly in sympathy with their necessities, and an open hand to render all the aid in her power.

Many orphan children can testify that she had been indeed a mother to them.

She was one of the earliest to espouse the anti-slavery cause; and although possessed of but a frail physical organization, yet no one in this country has rendered that hated cause more efficient service. She stood in no awe of public opinion: ever vigilant, ever active, untiring and unyielding for the right, yet she "opened her mouth with wisdom, and in her tongue was the law of kindness." In the midst of trials, temptations or proscriptions, she ever maintained the same calm, serene spirit. She had no concern or desire to build up or foster any system of theology; with creed-making she had no sympathy, but was actively and earnestly engaged to pull down and remove out of the way whatever stood in opposition to the pure spirit of universal liberty and toleration. Her desire for the elevation, liberty and happiness of all was far superior to her love or veneration for *institutions*.

She had been, from early life, a member of the Society of Friends, and steadily attended its meetings, when health and strength permitted, and as steadily did she bear an uncompromising testimony for the oppressed bondman, and against that spirit of conservatism and proscription which has been so sorrowfully manifested by much of the leading influence of modern Quakerism.

Through her efforts mainly (although actively opposed by prominent members of that meeting) the Friends' meeting-house at North Easton was first opened to anti-slavery meetings, some eight or ten years since, and from that time its doors have been kept open to the anti-slavery laborer, and to free discussion.

The numerous petitions that went up to Albany, during the past winter, from this town, for a Personal Liberty bill, were first put in motion through her efforts; while others thought best to wait and see the result in Massachusetts, she urged the importance of immediate action, saying "that much valuable time was lost by waiting to see the movements of others."

——"she did with cheerful will
What others talked of while their hands were still."

During the past summer, she felt impressed to apppoint some anti-slavery meetings in a neighboring town, which the writer attended with her; on our return she expressed great satisfaction, saying that "she felt her time for labor was short," and with this view she thus employed her last remaining energies. Her judgment was indeed "like a robe and a diadem"; her unselfish spirit and pure instincts led her to clear and just perceptions of the right.

At the funeral, her husband, in a brief and impressive manner, spoke of "his great and irreparable loss, and of the unselfish disposition she at all times manifested, especially during her illness, often expressing her fear that too much was done for her."

The constant, calm and even cheerful smile of her countenance was lovely to behold. Death was no "King of Terrors" to her. She remarked that "she felt it a blessed privilege to leave the mortal tenement, when it was no longer useful"; that she had "no desire to live after her capacity of usefulness had ceased"; also that she felt joy and satisfaction in contemplating her action in reference to reform movements, and hoped the young would press forward in the work of reformation and liberal Christianity.

A short time previous to her departure, she asked her son if he thought she would continue long; and when answered in the negative, she said, "I am ready," and again, "Oh, how beautiful! all nature seems so lovely!"

The following portion of Whittier's soul-thrilling lines was repeated at the funeral services, as being peculiarly appropriate:

Another hand is beckoning us,
Another call is given;
And glows once more with Angel steps
The path which reaches heaven.

The light of her pure life went down
As sinks behind the hill
The glory of a setting star—
Clear, suddenly and still.

Alone unto our Father's will
One thought hath reconciled;
That He whose love exceedeth ours
Hath taken home His child.

Fold her, oh Father, in Thine arms,
And let her henceforth be
A messenger of love between
Our human hearts and Thee.

Still let her mild rebuking stand
Between us and the wrong,
And her dear memory serve to make
Our faith in Goodness strong. J.

EASTON, 6th mo. 5th, 1859

To the Editor of The National Anti-Slavery Standard.

At a regular meeting of the old Saratoga Anti-Slavery Society, held at North Easton, Washington Co., 6th mo. 5th, 1859, the following resolutions were offered by J. W. PECKHAM, and unanimously adopted as the sense of the meeting and ordered to be forwarded to THE ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD and *Liberator* for publication.

Resolved, That, in the death of our beloved friend and coadjutor, ESTHER WILBUR (since our last-meeting in this place), we deeply feel that "a mother in Israel," one of the early advocates and main pillars of the anti-slavery enterprise, has been removed from our midst; that we shall no longer be cheered on by her presence, her living example and earnest words, nor encouraged and strengthened by her wise counsels, her unyielding fidelity and untiring labors in the cause of the oppressed; that a vacancy has been left that it will be difficult, if not impossible, to fill; and that the anti-slavery cause has lost one of its most clear sighted, radical and intrepid supporters, and every true reform story movement, however hated or proscribed, has met with a special bereavement.

Resolved, That, inasmuch as to her efforts it was largely due that the doors of this house were first opened to our meetings, we feel it due to her memory, to the cause of the slave, and to ourselves, that we thus publicly give expression to our sense of obligation to, and admiration of, her noble deeds and heroic spirit, in which we recognize the religion of the good Samaritan.

Resolved, That while we are grateful for the example she has given us, and for the earnestly impressive sermon in behalf of substantial goodness and liberal Christianity which has been so forcibly preached by her life, we feel that the highest eulogy and greatest tribute of respect we can possibly offer to her memory and character is by imitating, to the utmost of our power, her rare moral courage and noble virtue in laboring faithfully to carry forward those measures and principles of civil and religious liberty so dear to her, and to which her true and earnest life was so constantly and so especially devoted.

Very respectfully, J. W. PECKHAM.

CHARLES F. HOVEY'S WILL.

From The Tribune.

THE late Charles F. Hovey, whose bequest of a large sum for the advancement of certain moral and social reforms we mentioned a day or two ago, provided by will that the residue of his estate, after the payment of legacies, should be paid to certain persons, in sums not less than $8,000 annually until the same be all exhausted. The Committee are requested to use and expend, at their discretion and without responsibility to any one, not less than the said $8,000 annually in the promotion of the Anti-Slavery cause and other reforms, such as Woman's Rights, Non-resistance, Free Trade, and Temperance, "by the preparation and circulation of books, newspapers, employing agents, and the delivery of lectures that will in their judgment change public opinion, and secure the abolition of slavery in the United States, and promote said other reforms." "And," he continues, "believing that the chain upon four millions of slaves, with tyrants at one end and hypocrites at the other, has become the strongest bond of union of the States," he desires "said Phillips and his associates to expend said bequest by employing such agents as believe and practise the doctrine, 'No union with slaveholders, religiously or politically,' and by circulating such publications as tend to destroy every pro-slavery institution." In case chattel slavery shall be abolished in the United States before the residue of his estate shall be expended, he desires that the balance shall be used in equal proportions for the promotion of the other reforms named, but requests that no agents be employed "except such as believe it wrong to have any voluntary connection with any government of violence, and such as believe that the natural rights of men and women are equal." And whether slavery be abolished or not, he desires that some portion of the legacy be devoted to the promotion of the other reforms mentioned, but at the discretion of said Phillips and his associates.

His directions in regard to his funeral are equally explicit and remarkable. He says:

"I particularly request that no prayers be solicited from any person, and that no priest be invited to perform any ceremony whatever over or after my body. The priesthood are an order of men, as I believe, falsely assuming to be reverend and divine, pretending to be called of God; the great body of them, in all countries, have been on the side of power and oppression; the world has been too long cheated by them; the sooner they are unmasked, the better for humanity."

In relation to his remains, he gave this further direction:

"The fear of being buried before I am dead is slight; nevertheless, it is greater than the fear of death itself; I therefore request my execut

Miscellaneous Department.

THE OLD CATHEDRAL BELL.

The old cathedral bell,
In its lofty dusty tower,
For ages has its solemn knell
Proclaimed the passing hour,
With its steady song,
"Ding dong,"
Echoing the vaulted aisles along.

On massive oaken beams
Doth the mighty mouster swing,
But each a bending osier seems
When the bell begins to ring,
And its echoing song,
"Ding dong,"
Shakes the old tower that has held it long.

'Twas many a year ago
The ancient bell was young,
And with solemn rite and priestly show
In its lonely dwelling hung,
Since then its song,
"Ding dong,"
Hath monarchs' deaths and victories sung.

War, has its voice proclaimed,
And discord's fiery brand,
And battle, rout, and carnage named,
Wide-spreading o'er the land,
When its bellowing song,
"Ding ding,"
Has blanched the weak, and nerved the strong.

Now tolled in midnight deep,
Now rung in noontide ray,
Ushering a king to death's long sleep,
A new-born prince to day,
Still clear and strong,
"Ding dong,"
Unchanged its voice through centuries long.

The old cathedral bell,
It laughs at pomp and power;
Oft has it struck their passing knell—
Vain creatures of an hour—
Obtained by wrong,
"Ding dong,"
All full of care, nor lasting long!

The beggar in the dust,
It raises by its voice:
"In God thy Maker trust;
Rejoice in Him, rejoice—
Be firm and strong,
'Ding dong,'
Trial is short, and victory long!"

A lesson loud and clear,
It teaches all its days:
"Do steadily thy duty here,
And send to Heaven thy praise!
So shall thy song,
Like my 'Ding dong,'
At last be loud, and clear, and long!"

—*Chambers's Journal.* G. H. F.

WHY ITALY HATES AUSTRIA.

From The London Spectator.

People have been heard to ask, even in this year 1859, *why* the Italians were suddenly so impatient to get rid of Austria. The Italians are not "so impatient"; the wonder is that they have borne the infliction of repression, terror, suffering, loss and dishonor so long; but since Englishmen have forgotten how the misery has come home to individuals, we will give a few passages of the old story. We have lately received those Neapolitan exiles who could exemplify in their own persons the treatment that they had experienced under a government which daily violates the constitutional law of its own existence—a government against which our own had made a vain "demonstration," professedly to carry out the policy of 1856. At the other extremity of Italy the endurance of the natives was of an equally practical kind. Englishmen can have little idea of the annoyance which poisons the life of an Italian—say in Lombardy; but a very few facts may possibly exemplify the habitual condition of the people. The police of Milan may be said to consist of an Austrian soldiery—a police armed with the sabre, holding the authority of a conquering race, and exasperated by inevitable alienation. The Austrians, as the reader will presently understand, have rendered themselves so intolerable that Italians cannot associate with them; and if you enter the pit of a theatre, you will see the first few seats taken by Austrians, while the Italians, who are driven to the back, leave one seat entirely vacant between themselves and the aliens. If an English officer in the Austrian service discovers relatives of his own amongst the Italians in Milan, he forbears to notice them, lest they should become suspected and be driven from Italian society. We pursue the narrative in the language of an esteemed correspondent, who knows the country well, and travelled it in recent years:

In a recent paper on occupation in Italy, it is observed, "If England upholds such a system, it is only from ignorance of its enormities." In order to aid in enlightening this ignorance, may I ask you to insert the following extracts from the Austrian Penal Code, established in the Lombardo-Venetian provinces in 1815, with which few of your readers are likely to be acquainted, together with certain facts which may serve to modify the admiration occasionally expressed for the "paternal" rule of Austria. I could have added many more from my personal knowledge during a prolonged residence in different parts of Italy in 1853-54-55, but I have preferred offering such as can be authenticated by evidence which the most violent enemies of Italian independence cannot call in question, the *Official Gazette* of Milan.

To begin with the Penal Code. What do Englishmen say to this? 1. The proceedings are to be *strictly secret*. The defence of the accused to be given in writing; the prisoner can claim no defender, nor can he demand that the charges brought against him should be communicated to him. Article 337.

Corporal chastisement forms a fundamental part of the Code. High and low, rich and poor, man and woman are subjected to this degrading treatment—as degrading to the full in the eyes of an Italian as to those of an Englishman. True, "not more than fifty blows are to be administered at one time." In the case of youths under eighteen, and younger women, *rods* are to be substituted for the stick. Article 20.

When the sentence has been pronounced, the punishment may be augmented by the addition of *fasting* and the *bastinado*. Article 2 721.

Imprisonment is of three descriptions—*duro, piu duro, durissimo*. The latter is thus described in the Penal Code, article 14. "The prisoner is to be confined in a dungeon, shut out from all external communication, with just air and light sufficient to sustain existence. He is to be loaded with fetters hand and foot, day and night, and to be fastened by a chain to an iron ring riveted round his waist—except during the hours of work. His food is to be bread and water, soup once in two days, *no meat*. His bed is to be formed of bare planks, and it is forbidden to speak to any one, even his jailers." It was to this treatment that the illustrious patriots confined in the Spielberg were subjected; it is beneath similar treatment that some of the best and noblest Italians are now writhing. The Penal Code, section 377, commands "that in everything relating to the state, *the wife shall denounce the husband, the husband the wife, the child the father, the father the child, on pain of punishment as accomplices.*" Almost all political offences are still brought before what is called the "Tribunale Stadario" (sections 500–501 of the Penal Code). This tribunal is composed of military officers, Germans, Croats and Bohemians, who scarcely understand a word of Italian, and who, from habit, education and national prejudice, detest and scorn the Italian people. They speak German to each other; the witnesses are questioned in German, of which, if Italians, they, in their turn, seldom comprehend a syllable, while, if otherwise, they are sure to give their testimony against the prisoner. Thus, says Giovini, the learned author of "Austria in Italia," the accused, having no one to defend him, may be condemned almost without knowing his crime, and learn it only when he is informed "that in half an hour the rope will be around his neck." The slighest demonstration of popular feeling is visited by the most summary and brutal punishment. Thus, in 1849, on the birthday of the Emperor, certain hisses having been heard issuing from the midst of the crowd in one of the most frequented streets in Milan in front of the Café de Mazza, of which the object apparently was the Austrian flag hoisted in the balcony of a well-known courtesan, "all the passers-by were seized, dragged before a military tribunal, and condemned to different degrees of corporeal punishment, according to the degree of their offence," says the *Gazette Officiale* of Milan, 24th August, 1849. Among the accused were men of high standing and irreproachable character, *merchants, barristers, students*, many of whom probably were utterly ignorant of the whole affair, and two young girls, also perfectly respectable. The latter were condemned to *forty strokes each*. The sentence was executed instantly after being pronounced *on the public place* before the castle, in the presence of a troop of Austrian officers, who laughed with contemptuous cynicism at the indecent exposure and the cries of the victims. So far the tale. Now for the episode. The military commandant of Milan sent the municipality a bill for 33 florins 9 kreuzers (£2 19s. 6d.), for the expense of ice applied to the swollen, lacerated flesh, to prevent gangrene, and for the sticks and rods broken and consumed in the punishment of the seditious in the revolt of the 10th of August. In addition, the Marshal commanded the town to indemnify the courtesan who had been "terrified by the scene," with the sum of 20,000 livers (£600). How touching is the care of such a paternal government.

It may be objected that these disgraceful barbarities were committed only immediately after the revolution of 1848–49, at a period of great irritation. Did space permit, I could present you with countless well-authenticated cases, to prove that this system of tyranny and brutality commenced from the very moment that Italy was handed over, in 1845, to the mercy of her Austrian masters, that it is one from which Austria has never deviated, and which she imposes wherever she is mistress. What scenes have I not beheld at Leghorn, Bologna, Ancona, Ferrara, wherever the Austrians had established garrisons. Under pretext of defending Pius IX., they have taken justice or vengeance into their own hands, condemning to a summary and ignominious death, often without trial, hundreds of men, many completely innocent; levying enormous taxes in the name of the Pope, who never received one farthing of them; living in free quarters on the unfortunate inhabitants, and rewarding them by the bastinado, administered literally at pleasure, without distinction of rank or sex. (A recent "reform" appoints women to bastinado women.)

The following will be found in the *Augsburg Universal Gazette*, January 20, 1852—a paper not unduly partial to the Italians:

"Captain L., commanding officer of the 21st Austrian regiment of the line, posted at Perouse, has commanded forty blows to be administered in the public place to an estimable citizen, M. Monganelli, simply because he refused to receive a second Austrian officer when he had one already quartered on him. (There were only ten to be divided among all the inhabitants.) This arbitrary sentence was preceded neither by inquiry nor formality. The same officer, a few days before, inflicted forty blows on a poor peasant, who happened to have a cotton handkerchief round his neck which once had been of three colors, though they were nearly obliterated by repeated washings."

Not less deplorable is the universal venality of the Austrian administrators, civil and military, in Italy; they regard it as a conquered country, to be plundered *ad libitum*. This will account for those enormous fortunes which so many have accumulated. Nowhere is this exhibited so unblushingly as in the conscription, where youths utterly unfit by bodily infirmities for military services are inscribed as fit, merely for the purpose of extorting money to obtain their release. If they are suspected of patriotic or liberal sentiments, a different course is adopted; they are first permitted to *pay for a substitute*, and then seized and compelled by threats and blows to enroll in an Austrian regiment, to be sent to the marshes of Croatia, to be forced to fight against their own flesh and blood. It is said that the Lombard soldiers have returned with alacrity to their regiments. If so, the reason lies, doubtless, in the fact that the communes to which they belong are heavily fined for every soldier missing; that, in addition, their relatives are liable to the most cruel treatment in case of their desertion. Several cases of this description came under my own observation. Austria appeals to the treaties of 1815. Even supposing that any treaty can be sacred in which one nation is recklessly sacrificed, bound hand and foot to the ambition of another, how can Austria dare to invoke them? Did she remember them when she annexed the republic of Cracow to her dominions, in defiance of the protestations of Europe, under pretext that the tranquillity of Poland demanded that annexation? Dares she invoke them now that the peace and security of Europe, the best and holiest interests of humanity, are at stake? Surely the time is at hand when Europe will perceive that, even in an interested point of view, an Italy, strong, tranquil and independent, is preferable to one perpetually agitated by the convulsions of agony and despair, and in its turn agitating all surrounding nations.

It must be remembered that the police, as we have said, are armed soldiers, characterized by the manners of a common soldiery; the Italians are a very sober people. They abstain from going near the Austrian canteen not only because the spectacles there are intolerable, almost unimaginable to the Italian, but because the proximity is actually unsafe. That is not the worst. The Austrian soldiers are men of strongly developed physique; Italian women are particularly attractive; the soldiers feel themselves free to assail any woman, any lady, anywhere—even the presence of her husband not shielding her. And should he be provoked into a brawl with the soldiery, the police authorities, of course, know which side must be in the right. We have said nothing here of the drain of wealth from Lombardy-Venetia to feed Austrian tyranny; nothing of social misery flowing from political oppression; nothing of restrictions forced upon a land naturally made for commerce; we have spoken only of those sufferings which become personal in their pressure, and which make the Italian hate and loathe the very sight or sound of a live Austrian.

THE BABY SINGER.

It is the fashion to decry little poets and to despise the little songs they sing; and although we are not without our suspicions that the fashion has been set by little minds, since

> The Daisy we love, though the summer has Roses,
> And swallows may twitter though Nightingales sing,

we are not just now going to oppose ourselves to it.

We would venture, however, to remind critics of the "slashing" and "ripping" schools that it is, at all events, not necessary to snub a poet who confines himself to little subjects—inasmuch as a Fieldmouse disturbed by the ploughshare has, in fit hands, been probably the cause of awakening more human pity than the dethronement of any monarch.

Welcome, then, to Mr. Bennett, the Baby Singer, whom, at least, the Infant World acknowledge to be the true Laureate. This gentleman has harnessed his Pegasus to many a subject, political, humorous, and classical, and the divine animal has acquitted himself more than respectably in all; but in the Perambulator, in the Go-cart, in the conveyances, in short, which are patronized by the extreme youth of all ranks, its performances have been really unrivalled.

Mr. Gerald Massey's *Babe Christabel* has received due honor in these pages before now, and we are well known to appreciate its beauties; but there is, nevertheless, a certain super-celestial air about that young lady which *Paterfamilias*, at all events, shakes his head at, and declines to accept, as consonant with *his* experience.

In Mr. Bennett's descriptions, on the other hand, we seem to hear the very jerk of the cradle breaking the sweet monotony of the mother's song.

> Lullaby! O lullaby!
> Baby, hush that little cry!
> Light is dying,
> Bats are flying—
> Bees to-day with work have done;
> So, till comes the morrow's sun,
> Let sleep kiss those bright eyes dry!
> Lullaby! O lullaby!
>
> Lullaby! O lullaby!
> Hushed are all things far and nigh;
> Flowers are closing,
> Birds repcsing,
> All sweet things with life have done.
> Sweet, till dawns the morning sun,
> Sleep then kiss those blue eyes dry!
> Lullaby! O lullaby!

In the new volume before us* there are several excellent songs—those which have little children for their subject, as usual, the best—but there is none which quite comes up to our old favorite, *Baby May*. Perhaps some of our readers may be even yet unacquainted with that lyric of the nursery, in which case we could hardly do them a pleasanter piece of service than by extracting it. It is a poem with which every woman, and every man with a heart within him, is charmed at the first reading, quite apart from its perfectness as a work of art. It bears criticism, indeed, of the strictest kind; but just as their "mother's grave" bears the sons who come to "peep and botanize" upon it. Critics are warned off the premises as trespassers. "All the place is holy ground; hollow smile and frozen sneer" have no business there. Look at the child!

> Cheeks as soft as July peaches—
> Lips whose velvet scarlet teaches
> Poppies paleness—round large eyes
> Ever great with new surprise—
> Minutes filled with shadeless gladness—
> Minutes big with bliss nor sadness—
> Happy smiles and wailing cries,
> Crows and laughs and tearful eyes,
> Lights and shadows, swifter born
> Than on windswept autumn corn,
> Ever some new tiny notion,
> Making every limb all motion,
> Catchings up of legs and arms,
> Throwings back and small alarms,
> Catching fingers—straightening jerks,
> Twining feet whose each toe works,
> Kickings up and straining risings,
> Mother's ever-new surprisings,
> Hands all wants and looks all wonder
> At all things the heavens under,
> Tiny scorns of smiled reprovings
> That have more of love than lovings,
> Mischiefs done with such a winning
> Archness that we prize such sinning,
> Breakings dire of plates and glasses,
> Graspings small at all that passes,
> Pullings off of all that's able
> To be caught from tray or table,
> Silences—small meditations
> Deep as thoughts of cares for nations
> Breaking into wisest speeches
> In a tongue that nothing teaches,
> All the thoughts of whose possessing
> Must be wooed to light by guessing,
> Slumbers—such sweet angel-seemings
> That we'd ever have such dreamings,
> Till from sleep we see thee breaking,
> And we'd always have thee waking,
> Wealth for which we know no measure,
> Pleasure high above all pleasure,
> Gladness brimming over gladness,
> Joy in care—delight in sadness,
> Loveliness beyond completeness,
> Sweetness distancing all sweetness,
> Beauty all that beauty may be,
> That's May Bennett—that's my baby.

What naturalness of paternal pride there is in that last line! How easy it is for a father to detect that *Baby May* must have been the author's *First*. Mr. Bennett might surely be got to do the "On the Birth of the Royal Infant" department of Mr. Tennyson's office, for half the sack, or—as we almost fancy would suit him better—for a portion of what royal caudle chanced to be going upon the interesting occasion. The great author of *The Princess* is not good at describing Babies.

> She felt it sound and whole from head to foot,
> And hugged and never hugged it close enough,
> And in her hunger mouthed and mumbled it,

is a perfect picture of a mother's joy upon her recovery of her lost infant, but the babe itself *(it!)* is dismissed with a single epithet, and that not a highly characteristic one—"soft." It is fair to add, however, that when the Laureate wrote that poem he was a bachelor, and might, therefore, have shared the belief of that inexperienced race, that whatsoever toucheth a baby, maketh a hole in the same.

Who but a real poet could have made such a subject as the following—which seems to belong, by rights, to the "Lilliputian Warehouse" in High Holborn or elsewhere—awaken thoughts at least deep enough for tears?

BABY'S SHOES.

> O those little, those little blue shoes!
> Those shoes that no little feet use!
> O the price were high
> That those shoes would buy,
> Those little blue unused shoes!
>
> For they hold the small shape of feet
> That no more their mother's eyes meet,
> That, by God's good-will,
> Years since grew still,
> And ceased from their totter so sweet!
>
> And oh, since that baby slept,
> So hushed! how the mother has kept,
> With a tearful pleasure,
> That little dear treasure,
> And o'er them thought and wept!
>
> For they mind her for evermore
> Of a patter along the floor,
> And blue eyes she sees
> Look up from her knees,
> With the look that in life they wore.
>
> As they lie before her there,
> There babbles from chair to chair,
> A little sweet face
> That's a gleam in the place,
> With its little gold curls of hair.
>
> Then O wonder not that her heart
> From all else would rather part
> Than those tiny blue shoes
> That no little feet use,
> And whose sight makes such fond tears start.

Such pathos is, unhappily, the staple of most songs composed upon babies. As frail as fair, they often bless us with their presence but for a little, and then depart, as though their angels could not spare them longer out of heaven. What slightest records of them then become to one pair of human hearts, or to the mother's heart, at least, "dread memories for years!" What priceless value does the awful Appraiser, Death, set upon things which were next to valueless before his coming! The picture which was as nought to us while we possessed the living reality is become a sacred treasure, and preserved in the innermost sanctuary at home.

THE LOCKET.

> O casket of dear fancies—
> O little case of gold—
> What rarest wealth of memories
> Thy tiny round will hold!
> With this first curl of baby's
> In thy small charge will live
> All thoughts that all her little life
> To memory can give.
>
> O prize its silken softness,
> Within its amber round
> What worlds of sweet rememberings
> Will still by us be found;
> The weak shrill cry so blessing
> The curtained room of pain,
> With every since-felt feeling
> To us 'twill bring again.
>
> 'Twill mind us of her lying
> In rest soft-pillowed deep,
> While, hands the cradle shading,
> We stole upon her sleep—
> Of many a blessed moment
> Her little rest above
> We hung in marvelling stillness—
> In ecstasy of love.
>
> 'Twill mind us, radiant sunshine
> For all our shadowed days,
> Of all her baby wonderings,
> Of all her little ways,
> Of all her tiny shoutings,
> Of all her starts and fears,
> And sudden mirths out-gleaming
> Through eyes yet hung with tears.
>
> There's not a care—a watching—
> A hope—a laugh—a fear
> Of all her little bringing
> But we shall find it here;
> Then tiny golden warder,
> O safely ever hold
> This glossy silken memory,
> This little curl of gold.

Thus far it will be owned this Laureate of Liliput, this Troubadour of the Bassinet, has borrowed of no brother of his craft; that his lyrics have been original as they have been natural and tender; but before we have done with him, it is but fair to show how he can hold his own, when entering the lists with some of our older poets. He does not expend his energies, indeed, as some of them did, upon Inscriptions for a Grotto, or Lines upon a Crystal Spring; but the form, intention and even metre of his lines are identical with many of theirs who have lived thus long, and are even now admired, with a not greater right, as we believe, to the laurel-crown than has Mr. Bennett.

Have Walter or Shenstone ever written, in the same manner, or anything more admirable than these two *Epitaphs for Infants*?

I.

> On this little grassy mound
> Never be the darnel found;
> Ne'er be venomed nettle seen
> On this little bean of green;
> For the little lost one here
> Was too sweet for aught of fear,
> Aught of harm to harbor nigh
> This green spot where she must lie;
> So be nought but sweetness found
> On this little grassy mound.

II.

> Here the gusts of wild March blow
> But in murmurs faint and low;
> Ever here when Spring is green,
> Be the brightest verdure seen—
> And when June's in field and glade,
> Here be ever freshest shade;
> Here let Autumn latest stay,
> Latest call the flowers away;
> And when Winter's shrilling by,
> Here its snows the warmest lie;
> For a little life is here,
> Hid in earth, forever dear,
> And this grassy heap above
> Sorrow broods and weeping love.

—*Chambers's Journal.*

* *Songs by a Song-writer.* By W. C. Bennett. Chapman and Hall. 1849.

SLAVERY IN CUBA.

From "A Vacation Voyage to Cuba and Back," by R. H. Dana, J.

It is difficult to come to a satisfactory conclusion as to the number of slaves in Cuba. The census of 1857 puts it at 375,000; but neither this census nor that of 1853 is to be relied upon, on this point. The Cubans are taxed for their slaves, and the government find it difficult, as I have said, to get correct returns. No person of intelligence in Cuba, however desirous to put the number at the lowest, has stated it to me at less than 500,000. Many set it at 700,000. I am inclined to think that 600,000 is the nearest to the truth.

The census makes the free blacks, in 1857, 125,000. It is thought to be 200,000 by the best authorities. The whites are about 700,000. The only point in which the census seems to agree with public opinion is in the proportion. Both make the proportion of blacks to be about one free black to three slaves; and make the whites not quite equal to the entire number of blacks, free and slave together. As to the Coolies, it is impossible to do more than conjecture. In 1853 they were not noticed in the census; and in 1857 hardly noticed. The number imported may, to some extent, be obtained from the records and files of the Aduana, but not so as to be relied upon. I heard the number estimated at 200,000 by intelligent and well-informed Cubans. Others put it as low as 60,000. Certain it is that Coolies are to be met with everywhere, in town and country.

To ascertain the condition of slaves in Cuba, two things are to be considered: First, the laws; and, secondly, the execution of the laws. The written laws there is no great difficulty in ascertaining. As to their execution, there is room for opinion.

At this point one general remark should be made, which I deem to be of considerable importance. The laws relating to slavery do not emanate from the slaveholding mind; nor are they interpreted or executed by the slaveholding class. The slave benefits by the division of power and property between the two rival and even hostile races of whites, the Creoles and the Spaniards. Spain is not slaveholding, at home; and so long as the laws are made in Spain, and the civil offices are held by Spaniards only, the slave has at least the advantage of a conflict of interests and principles between the two classes that are concerned in his bondage.

The fact that one negro in every four is free indicates that the laws favor emancipation. They do both favor emancipation and favor the free blacks after emancipation. The stranger visiting Havana will see a regiment of one thousand free black volunteers parading with the troops of the line and the white volunteers, and keeping guard in the Obra Pia. When it is remembered that the bearing arms and performing military duty as volunteers is esteemed an honor and privilege, and is not allowed to the whites of Creole birth, except to a few who are favored by the government, the significance of this fact may be appreciated. The Cuban slaveholders are more impatient under this favoring of the free blacks than under almost any other act of the government. They see in it an attempt, on the part of the authorities, to secure the sympathy and coöperation of the free blacks in case of a revolutionary movement—to set race against race, and to make the free blacks familiar with military duty while the whites are growing up in ignorance of it. In point of civil privileges, the free blacks are the equals of the whites in courts of law, as witnesses or parties, no difference is known; and they have the same rights as to the holding of lands and other property. As to their social position, I have not the means of speaking. I should think it quite as good as it is in New England, if not better.

So far as to the position of the blacks, when free. The laws also directly favor emancipation. Every slave has a right to go to a magistrate and have himself valued, and on paying the valuation to receive his free papers. The valuation is made by three assessors, of whom the master nominates one and the magistrate the other two. The slave is not obliged to pay the entire valuation at once; but may pay it in instalments of not less than fifty dollars each. These payments are not made as mere advances of money, on the security of the master's receipt, but are part purchases. Each payment makes the slave an owner of such a portion of himself, *pro parte indivisâ*, or, as the Common Law would say, in tenancy-in-common with his master. If the valuation be one thousand dollars, and he pays one hundred dollars, he owns one-tenth by himself and nine-tenths by his master. It has been said, in nearly all the American books on Cuba, that, on paying a share, he becomes entitled to a corresponding share of his time and labor; but, from the best information I can get, I think this is a mistake. The payment affects the proprietary title, but not the usufruct. Until all is paid, the master's dominion over the slave is not reduced, as respects either discipline or labor, or right of transfer; but if the slave is sold, or goes by operation of law to heirs or legatees or creditors, they take only the interest not paid for, subject to the right of future payment under the valuation.

There is another provision, which, at first sight, may not appear very important, but which is, I am inclined to think, the best practical protection the slave has against the ill-treatment by his master: that is, the right to a compulsory sale. A slave may, on the same process of valuation, compel his master to transfer him to any person who will pay the money. For this purpose he need establish no cause of complaint. It is enough if he desires to be transferred, and some one is willing to buy him. This operates as a check upon the master, and an inducement to him to remove special causes of dissatisfaction; and it enables the better class of slaveholders in a neighborhood, if cases of ill-usage are known, to relieve the slave without contention or pecuniary loss.

In making the valuation, whether for emancipation or compulsory transfer, the slave is to be estimated at his value as a common laborer, according to his strength, age and health. If he knows an art or trade, however much that may add to his value, only one hundred dollars can be added to the estimate for this trade or art. Thus the skill, industry and character of the slave do not furnish an obstacle to his emancipation or transfer. On the contrary, all that his trade or art adds to his value, above one hundred dollars, is, in fact, a capital for his benefit.

There are other provisions for the relief of the slave, which, although they may make even a better show on paper, are of less practical value. On complaint and proof of cruel treatment, the law will dissolve the relation between master and slave. No slave can be flogged with more than twenty-five lashes, by the master's authority. If his offence is thought greater than that punishment will suffice for, the public authorities must be called in. A slave mother may buy the freedom of her infant, for twenty-five dollars. If slaves have been married by the church, they cannot be separated against their will; and the master has the right to keep her nursing child. Every slave is entitled to his time on Sundays and all other holidays, beyond two hours allowed for necessary labor, except on sugar estates during the grinding season. Every slave born on the island is to be baptized and instructed in the Catholic faith, and to receive Christian burial. Formerly, there were provisions requiring religious services and instruction on each plantation, according to its size; but I believe these are either repealed or become a dead letter. There are also provisions respecting the food, clothing and treatment of slaves in other respects, and the providing of a sick room and medicines, &c.; and the government has appointed magistrates, styled Sindicos, numerous enough, and living in all localities, whose duty it is to attend to the petitions and complaints of slaves, and to the measures relating to their sale, transfer or emancipation.

As to the enforcement of these laws, I have little or no personal knowledge to offer; but some things, I think, I may treat as reasonably sure, from my own observation, and from the concurrent testimony of books, and of persons of all classes with whom I have conversed.

The rule respecting religion is so far observed as this, that infants are baptized, and all receive Christian burial. But there is no enforcement of the obligation to give the slaves religious instruction, or to allow them to attend public religious service. Most of those in the rural districts see no church and no priest, from baptism to burial. If they do receive religious instruction, or have religious services provided for them, it is the free gift of the master.

Marriage by the church is seldom celebrated. As in the Roman church marriage is a sacrament and indissoluble, it entails great inconvenience upon the master, as regards sales or mortgages, and is a restraint on the negroes themselves, to which it is not always easy to reconcile them. Consequently, marriages are usually performed by the master only, and, of course, carry with them no legal rights or duties. Even this imperfect and dissoluble connection has been but little attended to. While the slave trade was allowed, the planters supplied their stock with bozales (native Africans) and paid little attention, even on economic principles, to the improvement, or, speaking after the fashion of cattle-farms, to the increase of the stock on the plantation. Now that importation is more difficult, and labor is in demand, their attention is more turned to their own stock, and they are beginning to learn, in the physiology of increase, that canon which the Everlasting has fixed against promiscuous intercourse.

The laws respecting valuation, the purchase of freedom at once or by instalments, and the compulsory transfer, I know to be in active operation in the towns, and on plantations affording easy access to towns or magistrates. I heard frequent complaints from slaveholders and those who sympathized with them as to the operation of these provisions. A lady in Havana had a slave who was an excellent cook; and she had been offered $1,700 for him and refused it. He applied for valuation for the purpose of transfer, and was valued at $1,000 as a laborer, which, with the $100 for his trade, made a loss to the owner of $600; and, as no slave can be subsequently sold for a larger sum than his valuation, this provision gave the slave a capital of $600. Another instance was of a planter near Matanzas, who had a slave taught as a carpenter; but after learning his trade, the slave got himself transferred to a master in the city, for the opportunity of working out his freedom on holidays and in extra hours. So general is the enforcement of these provisions that it is said to have resulted in a refusal of many masters to teach their slaves any art or trade, and in the hiring of the labor of artisans of all sorts, and the confining of the slaves to mere manual labor. I heard of complaints of the conduct of individuals who were charged with attempting to influence the credulous and too ready slaves to agree to be transferred to them, either to gratify some ill-will against the owner or for some supposed selfish interest. From the frequency of this tone of complaint and anecdote, as well as from positive assertions on good authority, I believe these provisions to have considerable efficacy.

As to the practical advantage the slaves can get from these provisions in remote places, and as to the amount of protection they get anywhere from the special provisions respecting punishment, food, clothing, and treatment generally, almost everything lies in the region of opinion. There is no end to statement and anecdote on each side. If one cannot get a full and lengthened personal experience, not only as the guest of the slaveholder, but as the companion of the local magistrates, of the lower officers on the plantation, of slave-dealers and slave-hunters, and of the emancipated slaves, I advise him to shut his ears to mere anecdotes and general statements, and to trust to reasonable deductions from established facts. The established facts are that one race, having all power in its hands, holds an inferior race in slavery; that this bondage exists in cities, in populous neighborhoods, and in remote districts; that the owners are human beings, of tropical races, and the slaves are human beings just emerging from barbarism; and that no small part of this power is exercised by a low-lived and low-minded class of intermediate agents. What is likely to be the effect on all the parties to this system, judging from all we know of human nature?

If persons coming from the North are credulous enough to suppose that they will see chains and stripes and tracks of blood; and if, taking letters to the best class of slaveholders, seeing their way of life, and hearing their dinner-table anecdotes, and the breakfast-table talk of the ladies, they find no outward signs of violence or corruption, they will, probably, also, be credulous enough to suppose they have seen the whole of slavery. They do not know that that large plantation, with its smoking chimneys, about which they hear nothing, and which their host does not visit, has passed to the creditors of the late owner, who is a bankrupt, and is in charge of a manager, who is to get all he can from it in the shortest time, and to sell off the slaves as he can, having no interest, moral or pecuniary, in their future. They do not know that that other plantation, belonging to the young man who spends half his time in Havana, is an abode of licentiousness and cruelty. Neither do they know that the tall hounds chained at the kennel of the house they are visiting are Cuban bloodhounds, trained to track and to seize. They do not know that the barking last night was a pursuit and capture, in which all the white men in the place took part; and that, for the week past, the men of the plantation have been a committee of detective and protective police. They do not know that the ill-looking man who was there yesterday, and whom the ladies did not like, and all treated with ill-disguised aversion, is a professed hunter of slaves. They have never seen or heard of the Sierra del Cristal, the mountain-range at the eastern end of Cuba, inhabited by runaways, where white men hardly dare to go. Nor do they know that those young ladies, when little children, were taken to the city in the time of the insurrection in the Vuelta de Arriba. They have not heard the story of that downcast-looking girl, the now incorrigibly malignant negro, and the lying mayoral. In the cities they are amused by the flashy dresses, indolence and good humor of the slaves, and pleased with the respectfulness of their manners, and hear anecdotes of their attachment to their masters, and how they so dote upon slavery that nothing but bad advice can entice them into freedom; and are told, too, of the worse condition of the free blacks. They have not visited the slave jails, or the whipping-posts in the house outside the walls, where low whites do the flogging of the city house servants, men and women, at so many reals a head.

But the reflecting mind soon tires of the anecdotes of injustice, cruelty and licentiousness on the one hand, and of justice, kindness and mutual attachment on the other. You know that all coëxist, but in what proportion you can only conjecture. You know what slavery must be, in its effect on both the parties to it. You seek to grapple with the problem itself. And, stating it fairly, it is this: shall the industry of Cuba go on, or shall the island be abandoned to a state of nature? If the former, and if the whites cannot do the hard labor in that climate, and the blacks can, will the seven hundred thousand whites, who own all the land and improvements, surrender them to the blacks and leave the island, or will they remain? If they must be expected to remain, what is to be the relation of the two races? The blacks must do the hard work, or it will not be done. Shall it be the enforced labor of slavery, or shall the experiment of free labor be tried? Will the government try the experiment, and, if so, on what terms and in what manner? If something is not done by the government, slavery will continue, for a successful insurrection of slaves in Cuba is impossible, and manumissions do not gain upon the births and importations.

THE FIRST ENGLISH LACE-WEAVER.

SIR HENRY BORLACE.

It is singular that, in this age of book-making, neither volume nor pamphlet has been written to preserve to us the events of the life of Sir Henry Borlace. Two hundred years ago, this philanthropist and benefactor of his country lived on his patrimonial estate near Marlow, Bucks. His income was trifling, compared with the length of his rent-roll; but the farmers either would not or could not pay, and at that time not only they, but the whole agricultural population of the country, had obtained unenviable notoriety for pauperism and vice. Many causes, into which we need not at present enter, had tended to create and foster this excess of demoralization, which ended in a universal rejection of all attempts at productive industry. The demands of landlords who were pressing were met by audacious refusals, while persons who, like Sir Henry, expressed sympathy towards those from whom their own circumstances still compelled them to seek some payment in either money or kind, were answered by details of domestic afflictions, or by having sternly exposed to their startled view the previously half-concealed meshes of poverty and guilt in which the wretched speakers were hopelessly entangled. The landed gentry perceived that a crisis was at hand; but not knowing how to meet it, many of them withdrew into the towns. Sir Henry went from one proprietor to another, and from them to the people, endeavoring to bring into action the elements of reason, and justice, and truth. His success was not great. He found the landlords ready to admit the violence, the recklessness, the insubordination of their tenantry, but not ready to take any active part in their behalf, though in doing so they would have used the only check which could arrest their own downward progress. The people he found full of evil deeds, and yet with manly English hearts, on which poverty lay like a horrible incubus.

After some negotiation, carried on principally through him, public meetings were proposed. Much was hoped for from them, but they led to no useful result. Many were the conferences held; some of them were rather stormy; and at length one broke up with wild and terrible violence, lives being lost on both sides. It was an awful commentary on the absurdity of bringing into collision the moral and physical strength of the county—the men of wealth and culture, with men requiring food, needing restraint, incapable of trust. Sir Henry felt this, and perceived that a period critical for the interest, not only of Buckinghamshire, but of the whole country, had arrived. He resolved not to be instrumental in calling any further meetings, but alone to labor for the wretched men who, in the madness of their ignorance and debasement, had offered resistance to law and order. He determined also to persevere in his labor of love for them, until he had accomplished some practical means of social improvement and individual happiness. Many and weary, however, were the days and weeks which rolled by before he could see his way to any hopeful plan of usefulness. At length an idea presented itself suddenly to his mind. He is described as being at the time with his head bent over some statistical returns, and computing the difference between the number of laborers—supposing all, whose duty it was, did labor—and the number of those who depended on those laborers for the necessaries of life, when, suddenly starting up, he exclaimed: "I thank Heaven! I have found what I sought. The poverty, the misery, the crimes, the constant state of agitation and excitement of our peasantry, are not attributable to misrule, nor heavy taxation, nor unfair dealing, nor an oppressive feudal system, but simply to the absence of productive employment for females." It was a singularly plain solution of a case which was at the time taxing the wisdom of the legislature, and its worth has since been proven by its wonderous results—the influence which it has exercised on the condition not only of the county, but of the whole empire.

A day or two elapsed, and then he left his fine old paternal mansion with little more than a few coins in his pocket, and with his wallet literally slung from a stick over his shoulders. How he contrived to reach Holland (which was the place of his destination), or how to live there for two years, we are unable to narrate; all that is fully known is, that the manufacture of lace occurred to him as an employment in every way suited to the circumstances of the people of Buckinghamshire; requiring but little time to obtain a knowledge of, but little capital to commence with, and having an established home market, inasmuch as thousands of pounds were sent annually out of England to purchase the lace fabrics of Brussels, France and Germany.

Many years after he had returned home, he described the first check to the hopes with which he had set out as arising from a view of the bright and beautiful homes of the Dutch peasantry. "Can such an amount of comfort," was the thought suggested by his fears, "be mainly dependent on the peaceful home employments of women and children?" Circumstances which could not be controverted answered the question. He sought and obtained a home, first in one, and then in another, of those beautiful little Dutch nests of comfort and domestic love, and found that, in all, family attachments were of paramount importance in social relations; and that, as woman guided in her little domestic circle by her employments as well as by her feelings, so was she influencing, beyond the sphere of her ken, the vortex of human affairs.

After an absence of two years, Sir Henry returned to Buckinghamshire, accompanied by two lace makers, a mother and daughter, whom he induced to settle in the village of Marlow, where he endowed a school, or factory, in which twenty-four girls were taught the trade of lace-making. It was a small beginning for the glorious results which ensued. The girls succeeded each other rapidly, and in less than sixteen years, the lace-makers were no longer counted by units, but by thousands, and that not only in Buckinghamshire, but in Bedfordshire and Northampton. The change in the moral character of the people was rapid, and Sir Henry Borlace lived to see the day when the lace-makers' homes of England were as beautiful, as fresh and as happy as the homes which had almost startled him into unbelief by their beauty in Holland. His example shows how much may be accomplished by one individual. Truly, no man liveth rightly who liveth only to himself.

"Brussels point" was the name given to the lace then manufactured in Buckinghamshire. This is the lace which figures so beautifully in the portraits by Vandyke, and afterwards by Sir Peter Lely and Sir Godfrey Kneller. It was made of fine flaxen thread, woven on a cushion or pillow, by wooden bobbins, and the pattern of which was afterwards worked with the needle. As years rolled by, many improvements were effected in pillow-lace making and working, but none of any very extraordinary importance until 1800, when a new design was introduced at Honiton, in Devonshire, so delicate and beautiful as not to be exceeded by the finest specimens of Brussels lace.

Thirty years previous to the success of the Honiton lace, another new description of manufacture was invented by a poor man, whose motive to the attempt was solely a desire to amend the circumstances of his family. His name was Hammond; he was a framework-knitter, or stocking-weaver, at Nottingham. His loom was a hired one, and consequently he had but a small share of his earnings for himself. One day his wife sat near him while he worked; she held a baby to her bosom, and, as she stooped over it in all a mother's deep love, Hammond ceased his work to gaze on them both. The young mother wore a small muslin cap, which, as she bent her head, partly shaded her face from her husband and attracted his attention. A thought suddenly occurred to him that, by a modified action of his stocking-frame, he could imitate the border; and he knew that